



# THE ṬABAQĀT-I-AKBARĪ

OF

## KHWĀJAH NIZĀMUDDĪN AḤMAD

(A HISTORY OF INDIA FROM THE EARLY MUSALMĀN  
INVASIONS TO THE THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR OF  
THE REIGN OF AKBAR)

---

### VOLUME III

---

TRANSLATED AND ANNOTATED BY

BRAJENDRANATH DE, M.A., I.C.S. (RETIRED),

AND

REVISED, EDITED, AND COMPLETED WITH PREFACE AND INDEX, BY  
BAINI PRASHAD, D.Sc., F.R.A.S.B., F.N.I., F.R.S.E.

Printed at the Baptist Mission Press  
Published by the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal

---

CALCUTTA

1939



## PREFACE

In the Monthly General Meeting for August 1864 of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, Dr. W. N. Lees, one of the Vice-Presidents of the Society, read a memorandum<sup>1</sup> detailing the progress of Persian historical works in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series and the policy decided on in connection with the publication of such works. In discussing the projected publication of the '*Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh* or the *Tārīkh i Badāoni*', which had been suggested by Mr. E. B. Cowell in 1862<sup>2</sup>, he referred to the '*Tārīkh i Nizāmī* or the *Tabaqāt i Akbari*' as a very important work of reference and added that it is "well worth consideration, however, whether in conjunction with this work, we should not publish in lieu thereof a certain portion of the *Tabaqat i Akbari* which Abd al Qādir professes only to have abridged and which all later historians have made good use of"; the consideration of this suggestion, however, was deferred to a future meeting. In 1868 he wrote<sup>3</sup>, "it is inconceivable to me why so erroneous an estimate seems to have been formed of the *Ṭabaḳāt-i-Akbar-Shāhī* that it has not attracted more attention. It is the history which joins on to the *Tārīkh-i-Fīroz-Shāhī*, and is admitted by all contemporary and subsequent authors to be the standard history in continuation of those authorities. Unquestionably then the thread of the narrative as given by Nizām ud-dīn Aḥmad should be taken up where the authors of the *Tārīkh-i-Fīroz-Shāhī* have dropped it, giving him the preference to 'Abd al-Qādir of Badāon, or any other author, however excellent." Blochmann<sup>4</sup> in 1869 remarked "It is a matter of regret that the printing of the *Ṭabaqāt i Nizām i Bakhshī* was allowed to be deferred". Unfortunately nothing further happened till the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Journ. Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, vol. XXXIII, pp. 464-469 (1864).

<sup>2</sup> See Blochmann, *Journ. Asiat. Soc. Bengal*, vol. XXXVIII, pt. i, pp. 115, 116 (1869).

<sup>3</sup> *Journ. Roy. Asiat. Soc. (n.s.)* vol. III, p. 453 (1868).

<sup>4</sup> Blochmann, *op. cit.*, p. 115 (1869).



work was taken up by Mr. Brajendranath De in 1911, and the first fascicles of the text and translation of the first volume were issued in 1913. After this date the work remained in abeyance till the author was induced to take it up again in August 1925, and publication of the text and translation of the first volume ending with the fall of the Afghān Kings of Dehli was completed in 1927. The second volume of the text, ending with the 38th year of Akbar's reign and accounts of the *Amīrs* of high rank, the *Shaikhs* of Hindūstān, the *Ilakīms* and the poets of the reign of Akbar, was issued in 1931, while the printing of the English translation was completed in 1936—some 4 years after the death of Mr. De. The text of the third volume was completed by Shams-ul-'Ulama Khān Bahādur Hidāyat Ḥosain from an incomplete manuscript prepared by Mr. De in 1935. The work of editing and completing the third volume of the translation was assigned to me in April 1939; it was hoped that I would have the collaboration of Prof. Maḥfūz-ul-Ḥaqq in this work, but this has not been possible. The first half of the volume was published in July and the concluding part is now issued.

It is a matter of regret that a historical work of such importance, which the Society hoped in 1864 to publish at an early date, should have been delayed for almost three quarters of a century, but this was due to a variety of causes among which may be mentioned several large works which were being published by the Society, lack of funds and probably also the issue of a lithograph edition of the *Ṭabaqāt* by the Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow, in 1875.

The subject-matter in the following pages of the preface has been arranged under the following heads:

1. Life of Khwājah Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad Bakhshī.
2. *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, its sources and importance.
3. Life of Mr. Brajendranath De, M.A., I.C.S. (retd.),  
the editor and translator of the work.
4. Concluding remarks and acknowledgments.

#### LIFE OF KHWĀJAH NIZĀMUDDĪN AḤMAD BAKHSHĪ.

The author is variously styled as Mirzā Nizāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad, Khwājah Nizāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad or Nizāmī (*vide* Lowe's

translation of '*Muntakhabu't-Tawārikh*', vol. II, p. 479, 1924). In *Maāthīr-ul-Umarā* he is called Khwājah Nizāmuddīn Ahmad, while by Abū-l-Faḍl<sup>1</sup>, Mīr Abū Turāb<sup>2</sup>, Firishtah, and others the appellation of *Bakhshī* is added after his name.

Unfortunately the information about the life of the author is very limited, and the two accounts in *Maāthīr-ul-Umarā*<sup>3</sup> and by Elliot<sup>4</sup> seem to be based only on casual references in *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, *Akbarnāma*, *Ā'in-i-Akbarī* and *Muntakhab-ul-lubāb*. None of the authors give the date or year of the birth of Khwājah Nizāmuddīn Ahmad, and the information in this connection from contemporary sources is rather conflicting. Mrs. Beveridge in her translation of *Bābur-Nāma*<sup>5</sup> states that Nizāmuddīn Ahmad was not born till 20 years after Bābur's death. As Bābur died on Jumādā I, 937 A.H. (December 26, 1530 A.D.) this would mean that the Khwājah was born in 956 or 957 A.H. (1549 or 1550 A.D.). According to Al-Badāonī (*vide* Lowe, *op. cit.*, pp. 411, 412) Mīrzā Nizāmuddīn Ahmad died at the age of forty-five in the 38th year of Akbar's reign of a burning fever on the 23rd Šafar, 1003 A.H. (7th November, 1594 A.D.), which would mean that he was born some time in 958 A.H. (1551 A.D.). According to Shaikh Ilāhdād Faiḍī Sirhindī, the author of *Akbar-Nāma* (*vide* Dowson in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. VI, p. 130, 1875) he died at the age of nearly 48 years on the 22nd Šafar, 1003 A.H. in the 39th year

<sup>1</sup> *Akbarnāma*, text edition, vol. III, p. 605 (1886) and Beveridge's translation of vol. III, p. 924 (1912-1939). In these notes various volumes of the *Akbarnāma* and the *Ā'in-i-Akbarī* are cited as they have been issued in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series. It may, however, be noted that the *Ā'in*, which has been issued in three volumes, really formed the third and final volume of *Akbarnāma* (see Blochmann's Preface to the first volume of the *Ā'in*, Phillott's edition, p. v, 1939).

<sup>2</sup> Mīr Abū Turāb Valī's *History of Gujarat*, edited by E. Denison Ross, p. 104 (1909).

<sup>3</sup> *Maāthīr-ul-Umarā* by Samsāmud-Dowla Shāh Nawāz Khān, *Bibliotheca Indica* edition, vol. I, pp. 660-664 (1887-1894).

<sup>4</sup> Elliot's *Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Muhammadan India*, pp. 180-184 (1849) and *Elliot's History of India*, vol. V, pp. 178-180 (1873).

<sup>5</sup> *Bābur-Nāma*, vol. II, p. 704 (1921).

of Akbar's reign. Al-Badāonī's statement, in view of the fact that he was a close friend of Niẓāmuddīn Aḥmad, and was actively associated with him in the compilation of the *Ṭabaqāt*, appears to be more reliable, and I have little hesitation in accepting it as correct. The year of his birth may, therefore, be taken as 958 A.H. or 1551 A.D.

Unfortunately we have very little information about Khwājah Niẓāmuddīn Aḥmad's ancestry beyond the fact that he was the son of Khwājah Muqīm Harawī (of Herat), who was one of Bābur's officials and about the close of his reign was the *Dīrān-i-buyūtāt*<sup>1</sup>. After the death of Bābur, when Gujarāt was conquered by Humāyūn and the province of Aḥmadābād was entrusted to Mīrzā 'Askarī in 1535 A.D., Khwājah Muqīm was appointed his *wazīr*. He accompanied Humāyūn to Āgra when the latter fled after his defeat by Sher Khān Sūr at Chausa in Bihār on 26th June, 1539. Khwājah Muqīm also, according to the *Ṭabaqāt* (De's translation of vol. I, p. i) and *Maūthūr-ul-Umarā*, served under Akbar; this is again referred to in the *Ṭabaqāt* (De's translation of vol. II, p. 336) where in the account of the twelfth year it is stated "the author's father remained in Āgra, performing government work."

We know very little about the earlier years of life or the education of the young Khwājah, but according to Dowson<sup>2</sup> he was one of the pupils of 'Mullā Ali Sher', a learned man, and the father of Faiḍī Sirhindī, the author of *Akbar-Nāma*. There can be little doubt, however, that Niẓāmuddīn Aḥmad was a well-educated and well-read young man who, "according to the instructions of his worthy father<sup>3</sup>, occupied himself with the study of historical works, which brightens the intellect of the

<sup>1</sup> According to Mrs. Beveridge "a Barrack-officer" (*Bābur-Nāma*, vol. II, p. 703, note 2), but Dowson translates *Dīrān-i-buyūtāt* as the *Dīrān* of the household (*Elliot's History of India*, vol. V, p. 178, 1873).

<sup>2</sup> *Elliot's History of India*, vol. VI, p. 116 (1875).

<sup>3</sup> In this connection also see Mrs. Beveridge's remarks where she conjectures that Khwājah Muqīm lived long enough "to impress the worth of historical writing on his son" and probably "transmitted his recollections to him" (*vide Bābur-Nāma*, vol. II, p. 693, 1921).

studious and inspires the intelligent with awe; and by the study of the accounts of the travellers in the stages of the journey of existence, which is like a progress of the soul rubbed off the rust of his nature." <sup>1</sup> In addition to being a student of history and literature Khawājah Nizāmuddīn Ahmad was a patron of poets and apparently himself used to write poetry, though except for the few stray verses in the *Ṭabaqāt*, no extensive poetical work by the author is known. A reference, however, to Al-Badā'uni <sup>2</sup> shows that various poets such as Amānī, Baqā'i, Hayātī and Ṣarfī were invited to Gujarāt by the Khawājah during the seven years of his stay in that province, and they flourished under his patronage. It was also during this time that he started writing his *Ṭabaqāt*, and had as his associate Mir Ma'sūm of Blakkar, who was distinguished as a man of learning and historian <sup>3</sup>. The interest of Khawājah Nizāmuddīn Ahmad in historical matters and his skill as a writer is evidenced by the fact that when the Emperor Akhar ordered the preparation <sup>4</sup> of a history of the Kings of Islām in 990 A.H. (1582 A.D.) he employed the Khawājah as one of the seven authors for its compilation. According to Elliot (1849, *op. cit.*, p. 179) "the compiler of the *Sahihul-Akhlār* attributes another work on Indian History under the name of *Tārīkh-i-ʿIrīq*, to the author of the *Tabakāt-i-Akberī*, but I am not aware that there is any good authority for the statement." I have also not been able to find any other reference beyond a reference in the account of Sarūp Chand's '*Sahihul-Akhlār*' in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. VIII, p. 314 (1877).

<sup>1</sup> *Ṭab-qāt*, De's translation of vol. I, p. iv (1911).

<sup>2</sup> *Mustakhbat-ut-tawārīkh*, Haig's translation of vol. III (1925).

<sup>3</sup> See *ʿĀ'in-i-Akbarī*, translation of Blochmann, vol. I, Phillott's edition, p. 579 (1939).

<sup>4</sup> Vide *Mustakhbat-ut-tawārīkh*, Lowe's translation of vol. II, p. 328 (1924). This is the famous *Tārīkh-i-Alfi*, the introduction of which was written by Abū-l-Fadl, but curiously the Emperor commanded its preparation in 990 A.H. even though the history was to deal with the events that had happened "in the seven zones for the last one thousand years." See *ʿĀ'in-i-Akbarī*, translation of Blochmann, vol. I, revised by Phillott, pages xli and 113 (1939).



of Akbar's 'Divine Faith', who wore in office and had partly brought about his pardon. He may have imitated the example of his friend Nizāmuddīn, the historian, who, though a pious Muslim, managed to rise higher and higher in Akbar's favour by keeping his religious views to himself."

In addition to being a scholar he was a good soldier and administrator, as is clear from the meagre records available from such sources as the *Ṭabaqāt* and the *Akbarnāma*. There is practically no reference anywhere to any office held by the Khwājah up to about the thirty-fifth year of his life, the 29th year (*vide infra*) of Akbar's reign, though according to the *Dhakhīrat-ul-Khwānīn*<sup>1</sup>, he was, at the beginning of his career, Akbar's *Dīwān* of the presence (*Dīwān-i-Hudūr*), but no mention of this appointment is made in any other work. In the account of the 12th year of the reign (974 A.H., 1567 A.D.) the author states (De's translation of vol. II, p. 336) that when the Emperor went to attack 'Alī Qulī Khān the author remained at Āgra with his father, and spread a vague rumour about the heads of Khān Zamān and Bahādur Khān having been brought to Āgra. From the 12th to the 27th year (1567-1582 A.D.) of the reign there is no mention anywhere of Nizāmuddīn Ahmad, but he was apparently closely associated with the Emperor as one of the Court officials, for after crossing the Sind Sāgar, the Emperor sent him with a message to Shāhzāda Shāh Murād (*vide De, loc. cit.*, p. 549, but Al-Badāonī says "to the prince Shāh Murād and the *Amīrs*" *vide* Lowe's translation of vol. II, p. 302). He traversed seventy-five *karohs* "in one day and night" and after delivering the message to the Shāhzāda, returned with his reply to the Emperor at Peshāwar. He then accompanied the Emperor on his march to Kābul and must have held some important post, for when the Emperor<sup>2</sup> had a list of all pious

<sup>1</sup> *Vide Maāthīr-ul-Umarā*, text vol. I, p. 661, and Dowson in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. V, p. 178 (1873).

<sup>2</sup> See Lowe's translation of *Muntakhabu't-tawārīkh*, vol. II, p. 305. A curious inaccuracy to which reference may be made occurs here. Al-Badāonī here states that he had become acquainted with Khwājah Nizāmuddīn Ahmad about a year back, *i.e.*, about 989 A.H. or 1581 A.D., but Blochmann (*op. cit.*, p. 122), apparently misinterpreting the reference to

people (Lowe translates *اعلى سعادت* as the people of piety), who were accompanying the army or were absent, prepared by the *Šadr-i-Jahān*, he arranged that Al-Badāonī, who was absent, be shown in the return as sick. In the 29th<sup>1</sup> year of Akbar's reign (991 A.H., 1583 A.D.) the government of Gujarāt was transferred from Shihābuddīn to I'timād Khān who, after the murder of Sultān Maḥmūd, had been the virtual king of Gujarāt till its conquest by Akbar in 980 A.H., and Khwājah Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad was appointed the *Bakhshī*<sup>2</sup>. Abū Turāb's

Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad's activities at Āgra in 974 A.H. referred to above and in the *Muntakhab* (text, vol. II, p. 99), states that Al-Badāonī met him at Āgra in 974 "and became his warm friend."

<sup>1</sup> Khwājah Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad in the *Ṭabaqāt* (De's translation of vol. II, p. 561, 1936) includes this in the account of the events of the 29th year which begins on page 558 and is followed by Al-Badāonī (Lowe's translation of vol II of *Muntakhabu't-tawārīkh*, p. 332) and in *Maḥṣūn-ul-Umarā* (text edition, vol. I, p. 661). Abū-l-Faḍl in *Albarnāma* (vol. III, text edition, p. 403, English translation, p. 596) states, these appointments took place in the 28th year of the reign. In this connection reference may be made to De (*Ṭabaqāt*, English translation of vol. II, p. 559, note 1) where several discrepancies in the dates between *Albarnāma* and *Ṭabaqāt* are pointed out; the former places the various events enumerated by De a year advance of the dates given in the latter. Inaccuracies in regard to the reckonings of the years of Akbar's reign on the part of Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad are pointed out by Al-Badāonī (ride Lowe's translation of vol. II, pp. 353, 363), and he explains these as being due to the author having not taken into account "the intercalated days, which every three years makes a difference of one lunar month, there is a difference in each cycle of a whole year, between the solar and lunar years", and his being away from the Imperial Camp in Gujarāt. After the death of Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad the dates in the *Ṭabaqāt* were checked and at least one corrected by his son Muḥammad Sharif. In spite of the above, as Al-Badāonī follows the *Ṭabaqāt*, it seems that the dates as they now stand in the *Ṭabaqāt* are the corrected dates.

According to Denison Ross (*A History of Gujarat*, introduction, p. 5, 1909) the year in which 'I'timād Khan was made governor of Gujarāt' was 992 A.H. (1583 A.D.).

<sup>2</sup> Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad's name is included in the list of *Bakhshīs* of Akbar's reign (ride Phillott's edition of Blochmann's translation of *Ā'in-i-Akbarī*, vol. I, p. 596), and apparently at this time no distinction was made between *Bakhshī* and *Mīr Bakhshī*, as what is called *Bakhshī*

account (*loc. cit.*, pp. 100, 101) of these appointments is rather vague, but in the *Ṭabaqāt* (p. 563) the author refers to his joining Iʿtmād Khān at Bijāpūr en route to Aḥmadābād after his appointment as the *Bakhshī*. The vacillating policy in reference to the affairs in Gujarāt<sup>1</sup> adopted by Iʿtmād Khān and the disturbances due to the intrigues of Shihābuddīn Aḥmad Khān and Quṭbuddīn Khān led to Aḥmadābād being occupied by Nannū or Muzaḥḥar Gujarātī, and the rout of the Imperial forces outside the town. The Khwājah sent an account of all that had happened to Akbar, and as a result Mirzā Khān<sup>2</sup> son of Bairām Khān was sent with a well-equipped army to quell the disturbances in Gujarāt. It is not necessary to deal here with the campaign against Sulṭān Muzaḥḥar of Gujarāt, but a review of the period distinctly shows that throughout the campaign and earlier Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad proved a very valuable officer, and whether as a commander, and even as an active fighter, he gave a very good account of himself.

He successfully carried out negotiations with Shihābuddīn, made arrangements for the defence of Aḥmadābād in the

---

in the *Ṭabaqāt* is Mīr Bakhshī in *Muntakhab-ut-tawārikh*. Abū-l-Faḍl in his introduction of the *Ā'in* (*vide* Phillott, *loc. cit.*, p. 5) mentions the *Mīr-bakhshī* as one of the nobles of the State, and Blochmann gives "Paymaster of the court" as its equivalent. For an account of *Bakhshī* see Banarsi Prasad, *History of Shahjahan* (1932), page 276, from which it appears that this officer "was the head of the Military Department, and looked after recruitment, reviews, and other similar affairs connected with the army." Further distinction had been introduced in reference to the *Mīr* or Chief *Bakhshī*, while separate *Bakhshīs* were attached to each division during military campaigns. According to Sarkar (*Mughal Administration*, p. 24, 1924) there were three subordinate *Bakhshīs* at the end of 'Aurangzib's reign'. In view of the above and the active part played by Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad in the military campaigns and the administration of Gujarāt, the equivalents pay-master (De, *op. cit.*) and paymaster-general (Low, *loc. cit.*, p. 393) hardly appear to be appropriate. For a detailed discussion of *Bakhshī* and its various grades see Irwine—*The Army of the Indian Moghuls*, pp. 37–40 (1903).

<sup>1</sup> See Boveridge's translation of *Akbarnāma*, vol. III, pp. 607–611, and *Ṭabaqāt*, De's translation of vol. II, pp. 563–567.

<sup>2</sup> *Ṭabaqāt*, De's translation of vol. II, pp. 567, 571, 572, and Boveridge's translation of *Akbarnāma*, vol. III, p. 613.



absence of the main force, defeated the forces of Sher Khān at Jūtānah, arranged for the attack on Muẓaffar's forces by Quṭbuddīn Khān from Bahroj and Baroda, attacked Muẓaffar's army from the rear at Sarkhej which resulted in its defeat, and later was mainly responsible for the defeat of Muẓaffar in the hills of Nādot. For his services in the Gujarāt campaign he was honoured with the gift of a horse and a robe of honour and an increase in his stipend. Later he carried out a successful campaign in Sorath and in the Ran of Kach. Mīrzā Khān, who had meanwhile been honoured with the title of Khān Khānān, was, at his own request, recalled to the Royal Court, and Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad with Qulij Khān and Naurang Khān was left in charge of Gujarāt. During the Khān Khānān's absence Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad proved a very energetic officer, and successfully carried out a protracted campaign against Muẓaffar and his partisans in the Ran of Kach, and later subjugated the *Kolis* and *Grāssi-yahs* in the neighbourhood of Aḥmadnagar. His skill as a commander and administrator is indicated throughout all these campaigns by the fact of his skillfully arranging the movements of the troops, attacking the enemy before its forces could be consolidated, his ruse for the relief of Ākhār, launching vigorous rear attacks in various battles, the establishments of *thānas* or military posts and the construction of forts.

This very successful term of office culminated in the Khawājah's being summoned to the Imperial Court in 996 A.H., when A'zam Khān was appointed as the Governor of Gujarāt<sup>1</sup>. Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad traversed a distance of some 600 *karohs* in the course of twelve days, and reached Lāhore on the 3rd *Nauroz* of the 35th year of Akbar's reign. According to Al-Badāonī<sup>2</sup>, Akbar gave orders that the camel-drivers should appear before him in the *Mahjar* in the same condition in which they had arrived, and they were a wonderful spectacle. After that he received boundless favours from the Emperor, and gained a great ascendancy over the mind of his royal patron. It was

<sup>1</sup> For details see *Ṭabaqāt*, De's translation of vol. II, pp. 563-595, where references to other works and several discrepancies in dates and the different accounts are noted.

<sup>2</sup> See Lowe's translation of *Muntakhabu't-tawārikh*, vol. II, p. 384.

about this time that he was appointed in-charge of the provinces of Ajmīr, Gnjārūt and Mālwah, apparently of the *Khālṣa* lands <sup>1</sup>. Towards the end of *Sha'bān*, 999 A.H., he was granted the *parganaḥ* of Shamasābūd as his *jāgīr* and was allowed five months' leave of absence to arrange matters there. In the year 1000 A.H. (1591-92 A.D.) when Āṣaf Khān *Bakhshī* was appointed to the Kābul campaign, Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad was appointed as the *Bakhshī* <sup>2</sup> in his place.

Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad accompanied Akbar to Kashmīr, and apparently was a great favourite of the Emperor at this time. His account of Kashmīr is not very detailed and the history of Akbar terminates with the end of the 38th year of his reign. The author describes it as having been written "in a summary manner by the pen of broken writing" .... "but most of the great events have been succinctly narrated". "If life helps (me) and God's favour helps (me), the events of the coming years also, if the dear God so wills, will be noted down, and will be made a part of this worthy book. Otherwise, anyone who may be guided by the grace of God, having engaged himself in writing it down, will attain to great good fortune." <sup>3</sup>

While staying at Lāhore in attendance on the Emperor, Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad laid out or purchased a garden, and it was in this garden that he was buried after his death. At this time he is described by Al-Badā'ūnī as having "entered on affairs with great energy and activity. He became the focus of all sorts of favours from the Emperor, and the recipient of his perfect trust with regard to his ability, good sense, sincerity, honesty and perseverance." He would probably have risen to much greater heights, but "suddenly at the very acme of his eminence, and the height of his activity, to the disappointment of the hopes of friends and strangers a dreadful blow was received from Fate, and at the age of forty-five he succumbed to a burning fever." <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Boveridge's translation of *Akbarnāma*, vol. III, p. 924.

<sup>2</sup> See Lowo's translation of *Muntakhabu't-tawārīkh*, vol. II, p. 393. According to Lowo, *Bakhshī* was the paymaster-general.

<sup>3</sup> *Vide Tabaqāt*, Do's translation of vol. II, p. 652. The last sentence is quoted incorrectly in the life of the author in *Maāthīr-ul-Umarā*.

<sup>4</sup> Lowe's translation of *Muntakhabu't-tawārīkh*, vol. II, p. 411.

The events preceding his death are described in greater detail in *Akbarnāma*<sup>1</sup> where it is stated that on 14th *Ṣafar*, 1003 A.H. (19th October, 1594 A.D.), at Shāham 'Alī, near Lāhore, he developed high fever while on a hunting expedition with the Emperor. His sons obtained leave to convey him to Lāhore, but he died on the 23rd<sup>2</sup> *Ṣafar* (28th October, 1594 A.D.) on the banks of the river Rāvi.

In the *Akbarnāma* (*loc. cit.*) it is stated that Akbar's "discerning heart was somewhat grieved, and he begged for forgiveness for him at the court of God. Strangers and acquaintances mourned, and honesty (*rāstī*) indulged in grief."

Al-Badāonī's account (*vide* Lowe, *op. cit.*, p. 412) is more detailed and is quoted here to indicate the regard and reverence in which he was held by all:

"There was scarcely anyone of high or low degree in the city, who did not weep over his bier, and recall his gracious qualities, and gnaw the back of the hand of regret."

The last line of the *Qit'ah* which was composed on this occasion gives the year (1003 A.H.) of his death:

گوهرِ بی بها ز دنیا رفت<sup>3</sup>

(A priceless pearl has left the world.)

### *TĀRĪKH-I-AKBARĪ* : ITS SOURCES AND IMPORTANCE.

Before dealing with the work itself it would be useful to add a note here regarding the various names assigned to it. The author in his introduction<sup>4</sup> designated it the *Ṭabaqāt-i-*

<sup>1</sup> Beveridge's translation of *Akbarnāma*, vol. III, p. 1005.

<sup>2</sup> Faiḍī Sirhindī in *Akhbar-Nāma*, as noted already, gives 22nd *Ṣafar*, 1003 A.H. as the date of death of Khwājah Nizāmuddīn Ahmad Bakḥshī (*vide* Dowson in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. VI, p. 130, 1875); this is certainly incorrect.

<sup>3</sup> Text edition of *Muntakhab Al-Tawarikh* by Lees, Kabir al-Din Ahmad and Ahmad Ali, vol. II, p. 398 (1865).

<sup>4</sup> See De's translation of vol. I, p. 6 (1911). The date comes to 1001 A.H. (50 ÷ 900 + 1 + 40 + 10) or 1592 A.D. The author died in 1003 A.H., 1594 A.D., and he was apparently working at it for several years before his death. See Ranking's translation of *Muntakhabu-t-tawārikh*, vol. I, pp. 9,

*Akbar-Shāhī* and stated that the word *Nizāmī*, the name of the author, gives the chronogram of the date of its compilation. In *Rauḍat-ut-Tāhīrīn* by Tāhir Muḥammad, the work is called *Tārīkh-i-Sultān Nizāmī*<sup>1</sup>, but this name has not been adopted by any of the later writers. The work is called the *Tārīkh-i-Nizāmī* by Muḥammad Hāshim Khāfi Khān in *Muntakhab-ul-Ikbal* (vide text-edition in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series, vol. I, p. 238, 1869). The same name was also used by 'Abd-ul-Qādir, also known as Al-Badā'oni<sup>2</sup>, in his *Muntakhab-ut-tawārīkh*, but he also calls it '*Nizām-ut-Tawārīkh*' (vide Ranking's English translation in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series, vol. I, pp. 9, 10, 1898). Firsihtah (*Tārīkh-i-Firsihtah*, Persian text, Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow, p. 4, 1884) designated it as the *Tārīkh-i-Nizāmuddin Ahmad Bakhshī*, and Col. Briggs in his translation (*History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India*, vol. I, Author's Preface, p. xlviii, 1829) calls it '*History of Nizam-ood-Deen Ahmad Bukshy*'. Blochmann (*loc. cit.*, p. 115), as noted already, calls it '*Tabaqāt i Nizām i Bakhshī*'. Several manuscripts, however, bear the name *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, and under this name the work is cited in various descriptive catalogues of Persian Manuscripts in most well-known European libraries (for details

---

10, footnote 2, 1898). In this connection reference may also be made to Al-Badā'oni's remarks where in his description of the events of the year 1002 A.D. he says "Let not the intelligent reader be ignorant of the fact that as to that which has been written up to this point the source of the greater part of it is the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī Shāhī* (sic), the date of which, I, this erring author, after much thought found to be *Nizāmī*. Having presumed the said author to allow me, I wrote a part of the book myself." (Lowe's translation of vol. II, p. 403).

<sup>1</sup> Fole W. H. Morley, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Historical Manuscripts*, p. 68 (1861), and Dawson in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. V, p. 177 (1873). For details of the work *Rauḍat-ut-Tāhīrīn* see Beveridge, *Journ. As. Soc. Bengal (n.s.)* vol. XIV, pp. 269-277 (1918). Unfortunately the only manuscript of this work in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal (No. 42, vide *Iranoff's Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts*, p. 13, 1924) is incomplete, and I have not, therefore, been able to verify this reference.

<sup>2</sup> For a critical note in reference to *Al-Badā'oni* see Blochmann, *loc. cit.*, pp. 119, 120 (1869).

see M. Hidāyat Ḥosain's preface to *Tārīkh-i-Shāhī*, p. vii, footnote 1, 1939). This name was apparently first adopted by Elliot <sup>1</sup> who remarked that "the name by which it is best known in literary circles is *Tabakāt-i-Akberī*", and this was also selected for the edition issued by the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal in preference to *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbar-Shāhī*, to avoid confusion with a work of the same name by Khwājah 'Aṭā Beg Qazvinī written about 1014 A.H., 1605 A.D. According to Ranking (*loc. cit.*) the work is simply known as 'Tabaqāt,' while Lees (*Journ. Roy. As. Soc. (n.s.)* vol. III, p. 455, 1868) erroneously designates it as the '*Tārīkh-i-Ṭabakāt-i-Akbar-Shāhī*'.

Beveridge <sup>2</sup> in dealing with the sources of *-Akbar-nāma* stated that the 'Tabaqat-Akbari' and 'Badayuni's abridgment thereof' (*Muntakhab-ut-tawārīkh*) "were probably written under Akbar's orders or inspired by his action." In the introduction to *Akbar-nāma* <sup>3</sup> while referring to Abū-l-Faḍl's love for sources or the *Quellen*, he remarked that "to him we owe not only the *Akbar-nāma* but also the Memoirs of Gulbadan Begam, Jauhar the ewer-bearer, Bajazat (Bāyazīd) Biyat and perhaps Nizāmu-d-dīn's history". Neither of the two views is upheld by a study of the contemporary sources. The work was started and completed by the author at his own initiative and there is no mention anywhere of either Akbar or Abū-l-Faḍl having sponsored or inspired its compilation. He certainly was helped <sup>4</sup> in the work by such friends as Mīr Ma'ṣūm of Bhakkar <sup>5</sup>, 'Abdul Qādir Al-Badāonī <sup>6</sup> and others, but the major part of the work

<sup>1</sup> Elliot's *Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Muhammedan India*, vol. I (the only volume ever issued), p. 179 (1849). Also see Elliot's *History of India*, vol. V, p. 177 (1873).

<sup>2</sup> *Journ. Asiat. Soc. Bengal (n.s.)* vol. XIV, p. 469 (1919).

<sup>3</sup> *Akbar-nāma*, Beveridge's translation of vol. III, introduction p. xi (1939).

<sup>4</sup> *Maāthir-ul-Umarā*, text edition, vol. I, p. 663.

<sup>5</sup> For an account of this great author, historian and administrator see *Ā'in-i-Akbarī*, Phillott's edition of Blochmann's translation of vol. I, pp. 578-580 (1939).

<sup>6</sup> Lowe's translation of *Muntakhabu't-tawārīkh*, vol. II, p. 403.

was his own composition, based on a study of several historical works and such independent information as he could collect from various sources by research and industry<sup>1</sup>. His history of the Akbar's reign is based on personal observations, on information obtained from firsthand sources and probably to some extent on Abū-l-Faḍl's *opus magnum* the *Akbarnāma*<sup>2</sup>.

In the introduction and dedication of the *Ṭabaqāt Khwājah* Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad explains the genesis of the work as follows:

"It came to the dull understanding of the author that he should, with the pen of truth and candour, write a comprehensive history which should present in a clear style, in its different sections, an account of the Empire of Hindustan from the time of Sabuktigin which began with the year 367 A.H., when Islam first appeared in the country of Hindustan, to the year 1001 A.H., corresponding with the thirty-seventh year of the Divine era, which was inaugurated at the epoch-making accession of His Majesty, the vicegerent of God; and should embellish the end of each section with the story of the victories of His Majesty's glorious army, which is as it were an introduction to the sublime chronicle of renown; then he should give a comprehensive account of all the victories and events and occurrences of His Majesty's reign each in its own place. The details of these events are contained in the great history called the *Ākbar-nāmah*, which that embodiment of all excellence, the learned in all truths and knowledge, the personification of worldly and spiritual perfection, the favoured of his Majesty the Emperor, the most erudite Sheikh Abul Fazl who is the preface of all excellence and

---

<sup>1</sup> The words in *Maāthir* (*loc. cit.*) are

و چون جز رسی و دقت در تنقیح اخبار و سعی تمام بفراهم آوردن

مواد بکار برده \*

<sup>2</sup> I have included *Akbarnāma* as one of his sources, as it is mentioned in the introduction, but in view of various discrepancies in the accounts in the *Ṭabaqāt* and *Akbarnāma* it is very doubtful whether he really utilized it to any extent in the compilation of his own History.

eminence has written with his wonder-inscribing pen, and has made a chronicle for all times."<sup>1</sup>

The history actually starts from about 377 A.H. corresponding to 986-987 A.D., and not 367 A.H. as stated by the author in the introduction; an account of the earlier years in a few lines merely introduces Amīr Nāṣiruddīn Sabuktigīn and can by no stretch of imagination be regarded as a history of those years. According to the author, as will be seen from the quotation above, he deals with the history of India up to the year 1001 A.H. corresponding to the thirty-seventh year of Akbar's reign, and apparently it was this which was responsible for Mr. De describing it on the title-pages of volume I, both of the text and the translation, and of the text edition of volume II, as 'A History of India from the early Musalmān Invasions to the thirty-sixth year of the reign of Akbar'. The work, on the other hand, as is clear from a perusal of the author's concluding

---

<sup>1</sup> De's translation of the *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. I, p. v. The corresponding passage of the Persian text runs as follows:

بخاطر فاطر رسید - که تاریخی که جامع و مشتمل بر تمامی احوال ممالک هندوستان باشد - بعبارتی واضح از زمان سبکتگین، که سنه سبع و ستین و ثلثمائه - و ابتدا ظهور اسلام در بلاد هندوستان است - تا سنه احدی و الف - موافق سی و هفتم سال الهی - که مبداء آن از جلوس ابد قرین حضرت خلیفه الهی است - طبقه بر طبقه مرقوم خامه صدق و سداد گرداند - و خاتمه هر طبقه را بفتح موكب عالی آنحضرت که عنوان رفعت نامه مفاخرست - اتصال دهد آنگاه مجملی از جمیع فتوحات و واقعات و واردات حضرت خلیفه الهی که این مختصرتر باید بجای خویش عرضه نماید - و تفصیل این اجمال - مفوض به کتاب عالیخطاب اکبرنامه است - که افضل پناه - معارف و حقایق آگاه - جامع کمالات صوری و معنوی - مقرب الحضرت السلطانی - علامی شیخ ابوالفضل که دیباچه مکارم و معالیمت - بقلم بدائع رقم نگاشته صحائف ایام ساخته \*

It will be seen that *احوال* has been translated by Mr. De as "comprehensive", *خامه صدق و سداد* as "with the pen of truth and candour" and *بعبارتی واضح* as "in a clear style".

paragraph of the account of Akbar's reign <sup>1</sup>, succinctly narrates the events up to the end of the 38th year corresponding to 1002 A.H. (1593-1594 A.D.), and this is confirmed by a reference to the *Akbarnāma* <sup>2</sup>. The consultation with the *Khān Khānān* regarding the Deccan campaign, which took place after the 8th Dai (or Di) of the 38th year near the town of Sultānpūr (or Shaikhūpūr), is mentioned in the penultimate paragraph of the account of Akbar's reign in the *Ṭabaqāt*. The mistake was corrected on the title-page of the translation of volume II, but to avoid ambiguity it would have been better to add the words 'the end of' before "the thirty-eighth year" or still better to use 'to the thirty-ninth year of Akbar's reign'.

Excluding the *Akbarnāma* the author cites the following twenty-eight works which he utilized in the compilation of his *Ṭabaqāt* :

1. *Tārīkh-i-Yamīnī*.
2. *Tārīkh-i-Zain-ul-Akhbār*.
3. *Rauḍat-uṣ-Ṣafā*.
4. *Tāj-ul-Maāthir*.
5. *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*.
6. *Khazāin-ul-Futūḥ*.
7. *Tughluq-Nāmah*.
8. *Tārīkh-i-Fīrūzshāhī* by *Ḍiyā Barnī*.
9. *Futūḥāt-i-Fīrūzshāhī*.
10. *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī*.
11. *Futūḥ-us-Salāṭīn*.
12. *Tārīkh Maḥmūdshāhī Hindwī* (*Mandwī* according to Rien).
13. *Tārīkh Maḥmūdshāhī Khurd Hindwī* (*Mandwī* according to Rieu).
14. *Ṭabaqāt-i-Maḥmūdshāhī Gujarātī*.
15. *Maāthir-i-Maḥmūdshāhī Gujarātī*.
16. *Tārīkh-i-Muḥammadī*.
17. *Tārīkh-i-Bahādurshāhī*.
18. *Tārīkh-i-Bahamānī*.

<sup>1</sup> *Ṭabaqāt*, De's translation of vol. II, p. 652 (1936).

<sup>2</sup> *Akbarnāma*, Beveridge's translation of vol. III, p. 996 (1910-1939).



19. *Tārīkh-i-Nāsiri* <sup>1</sup>.
20. *Tārīkh-i-Muẓaffarshāhi*.
21. *Tārīkh-i-Mirzā Ḥaidar*.
22. *Tārīkh-i-Kashmir*.
23. *Tārīkh-i-Sind*.
24. *Tārīkh-i-Bāburī*.
25. *Wāqī'āt-i-Bāburī*.
26. *Tārīkh-i-Ibrāhīmshāhi*.
27. *Wāqī'āt-i-Mushtāqī*.
28. *Wāqī'āt-i-Ḥadrat Jannat Āshiyāni Humāyūn Bādshāh*.

Unfortunately some of the works cited in the *Ṭabaqāt* are not traceable, but I give below short bibliographical notes on the authorities referred to in the above list.

1. *Tārīkh Al-Yamīnī* <sup>2</sup> by Alā' Naṣr Muḥammad bin 'Alī al-Jalbūr al-'Uṭbī is a history of the first two Ghuznavid sovereigns Subuktigīn and Maḥmūd. It was written about 411 A.H. (1020 A.D.). This work has been translated into Persian, and an English translation of the Persian version by Reynolds was published for the Oriental Translation Fund, London, in 1858. Full bibliographical details of this work were published by M. Hidāyāt Ḥasān in his *Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the Bihar Library*, vol. II, pp. 260, 261 (1923).

2. *Kitāb Zain-ul-Akḥbār* by Alā' Sa'īd 'Alī al-Ḥayy bin ad-Daḥḥāk bin Maḥmūd Gardezi is a very rare historical work. Only two incomplete manuscripts <sup>3</sup> of this work are known, one in the library of King's College, Cambridge (213), and the other in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Ouseley,

<sup>1</sup> Rieu (*Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. I, p. 220, 1879) cites numbers 19 and 20 as a single work under the title '*Tārīkh-i-Nāsiri-u-Muẓaffarshāhi*', but in the text the two read as:

تاریخ نامری و تاریخ مظفر شاهی \*

<sup>2</sup> ترجمه یمینی in *İrishtah* and '*Turjūmū Yemūny*' in Briggs (*loc. cit.*, p. xlix).

<sup>3</sup> For details see pages 1-4 of the Preface to Muhammad Nāzīm's edition of sections i-xiii of *Kitāb Zain 'l-Akḥbar* (E. G. Browne, *Mem.* Ser. I, 1928).

240); it has further been suggested that the Bodleian manuscript is only a copy of the one at King's College, Cambridge.

*Zain-ul-Akḥbār* is a general history of Persia from the Pishdādiyān dynasty, dealing particularly with the governors and rulers of K̲h̲urāsān up to ca. 440 A.H. (1048 A.D.). Unfortunately a large portion of the work is lost, but an edition of the first thirteen sections of the text was published by Muḥammad Nāẓim<sup>1</sup>.

As is pointed out by Muḥammad Nāẓim, Khwājah Nizām-uddīn Aḥmad Bakḥshī was the first author to utilize this work for his account of the Ghaznavid sovereigns in the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, and the discovery of this rare work must remain to his credit. Firisṭah also includes *Zain-ul-Akḥbār* amongst the sources of his *Tārīkh*, but in view of the fact that his account of the period dealt with in the *Zain* was based mainly on the *Ṭabaqāt*, it seems likely that he had only taken this reference from Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad's list.

3. *Rauḍat-nṣ-Ṣafā* by Muḥammad bin Khāwand Shāh bin Maḥmūd. Very little information is available about the birth or early life of the author, but he is stated to have died at Herāt in 903 A.H. (1497 A.D.). *Rauḍat* is a work on general history, from the creation of the world to the author's time. For details see *Ḥabīb-us-Siyar*, Bombay edition, volume II, pp. 198, 339, and Rieu's *Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. I, p. 87 (1879). A full account of the work and translations of some extracts by Sir H. M. Elliot are published in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. IV, pp. 127-140 (1872).

4. *Tāj-ul-Maāthir* by Ḥasan Nizāmī of Nishāpūr deals with the history of part of the reign of Mu'izzuddīn (assassinated 602 A.H., 1206 A.D.), the entire reign of Quṭbuddīn Aibak

---

<sup>1</sup> Vide note 3, p. xxii. The editor cites *Elliot's History of India*, 1869, as the first notice of this work. This is incorrect, as Elliot in his *Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Mohammedan India*, p. 83 (1849), had published a detailed note regarding the Ouseley Manuscript No. 240 which is now preserved in the Bodleian Library, Oxford; this was reprinted in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. IV, pp. 557, 558 (1872), while the 1869 reference cited by the editor is only a casual notice of the work in vol. II of the same publication (p. 432).

(602-607 A.H., 1206-1210 A.D.) and the first seven years of the reign of Shamsuddin Iltutmish (1211-1217 A.D.). A detailed account of the *Tāj* was published in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. II, pp. 204-243 (1869), while Ethé in the *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the India Office*, vol. I, p. 205 (1901) gives full bibliographic references.

5. *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī* by Minhāj Sirāj Jūzjānī is a very valuable historical work from the earliest times to 658 A.H. (1259 A.D.). The author in honour of his patron Nāṣiruddin Maḥmūd Shāh, king of Delhi (644-664 A.H., 1246-1266 A.D.), named it *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*. A detailed account of the work was given in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. II, pp. 259-383 (1869) and vol. VIII, pp. i-xxxī (1877), and full bibliographical references are given in Rieu's *Catalogue*, vol. I, pp. 72, 73 (1879).

6. *Khazāin-ul-Futūḥ* or the *Tārīkh-i-'Alāī* by Amīr Khusrū is a short but very important contemporary history of the reign of 'Alāuddīn dealing with the period 695-711 A.H. (1296-1312 A.D.). The work is very rare<sup>1</sup>, only two manuscripts, one in the British Museum (Or. 1638) and the other in King's College Library, Cambridge, are known. A lithograph edition<sup>2</sup> based on the British Museum manuscript was published under the editorship of 'Moīnuḥ Haq' in 1927, but, as has been pointed out by Dr. Mirzā<sup>3</sup>, it is "full of mistakes, due either to faulty transcription or to careless editing."

In his excellent study of Amīr Khusrū Dr. Mirzā (pp. 222-225) has given a detailed list of contents of the historical material of the *Khazāin-ul-Futūḥ* and discussed its literary peculiarities; Prof. M. Habib<sup>4</sup> in his introduction to the text-edition had also dealt with the literary peculiarities and the historical importance of this work.

7. *Tughluq-Nāmah* by Amīr Khusrau was quite unknown till recently, as no copies of it are preserved in any of the European or Indian libraries. Al-Badūonī (*Muntakhabu-t-tawārīkh*, Ranking's translation of vol. I, p. 301) remarks that it was the last of Amīr Khusrau's works, and "was written in verse in honour of the Sultān and in obedience to his order". Ethé in his *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the India Office*, p. 405, in the account of *Haft Iqlīm*, notes that the work consisted of 3,000 *baits* (verses). A manuscript entitled *Jahāngīrnāmah* by Ḥayātī Kūshī in the personal library of Maulānā Ḥabīb-ur-Rahmān Shirwānī of Ḥabībganj was recently identified as the *Tughluq-Nāmah* of Amīr Khusrau by the late Manṣūrī Rashīd Aḥmad Anṣārī. A detailed introduction, a summary of this work by the editor Saiyid Hūshnī Farīdūbādī, an incomplete descriptive note by Manṣūrī Rashīd Aḥmad in Urdū, and the text was published at Aurangābād, Deccan, in 1352 A.H. (1933 A.D.).

Relying on the statements in *Kashf-uṣ-Ṣunūn* and 'Abd-ul-Qādir Al-Badūonī's *Muntakhab-ut-tawārīkh* the *Tughluq-Nāmah* is believed to have been composed in 725 A.H. (1325 A.D.), but some part of the work had been lost even in Akbar's time, and in 1019 A.H. (1610 A.D.), Jahāngīr commissioned Ḥayātī Kūshī to supply the missing parts to complete the work. The work, as published, is believed to be what has been preserved of Ḥayātī's revised version, and consists of 2,920 verses. In view of the presence of a *ترکی* (catch-word) on the last page of the manuscript and a statement by Ḥayātī (*vide* verses 168-177) that he intends to complete the work by adding some further verses at the end, it is surmised by the editor that some of the folios at the end are missing. 179 verses in the beginning of the work are definitely identified as Ḥayātī's work, leaving a balance of 2,742 verses <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> There is apparently a mistake in the number of verses assigned to Amīr Khusrau, as after deducting 179 of Ḥayātī's verses from the total number of 2,920 verses in the work, the number should be 2,741 and not 2,742 as given on p. 2 of the work. In this connection also see the critical account of M. W. Mirza, *op. cit.*, pp. 245-253. He rightly does not include the *abyāt-i-silsilah* or the rubrics in verse in the number of verses, and is of the opinion that only 2,717 verses should be accepted as

by Amīr Khusrau. The editor in his introduction directs special attention to the historical importance of the work in connection with the following:—the murder of Sultān Quṭbuddīn, the last of the Khalji kings (716 A.H., 1316 A.D.), annihilation of the 'Alāī dynasty; Khusrau Khān's short-lived reign of a few days<sup>1</sup>, insurrection of the Tughluq (Ghāzī Malik later Ghiyāthuddīn Tughluq I), his correspondence with various Amīrs, advance to Delhi and victory over the usurper Khusrau Khān after two big battles, capture of Khusrau Khān and his brother, and finally his execution. This period (1316–1320 A.D.) marks the fall of the Khalji and the rise of the Tughluq Dynasty. On comparing the accounts in *Tughluq-Nāmah* with that in the *Ṭabaqāt*, it appears almost certain that the author of the latter did not make much use of the former in compiling his account of the period under reference.

8. *Tārīkh-i-Firūzshāhī* by Ḍiyā Barnī is a history of the Sultāns of Delhi from the accession of Ghiyāthuddīn Balban, 662 A.H. (1266 A.D.), to the sixth year of Firūzshāh's reign, 758 A.H. (1357 A.D.). It is the most important history of the period and was apparently the authority on which Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad and Firishtah based their works. The work was published in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series (1860–1862). A translation of the introduction and of the major part of the work was published by Dowson in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. III, pp. 93–268 (1871).

9. *Futūḥāt-i-Firūzshāhī* by the King Firūzshāh Tughluq (752–790 A.H., 1351–1388 A.D.) is a record of "the edicts and ordinances of his reign, the abuses and evil practices which he has put down, the buildings, monuments and works of public utility which he has carried out." A translation of the entire work is published by Dowson in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. III, pp. 374–388 (1871):

---

being by Khusrau. For a detailed analysis of the work also see Husain's *The Rise and Fall of Muḥammad bin Tughluq* (London, 1938).

<sup>1</sup> The period of Khusrau Khān's reign, who took the name of Nāṣir-ud-dīn Khusrau, was exactly two months, *vide Tughluq-Nāmah*, pp. 18, 19, from the 1st of Jumādā II to 1st Sha'bān, 720 A.H. (9th July to 6th September, 1320 A.D.).

10. *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī* by Yahya bin Ahmad bin 'Abdullah Sirhindī is a history of the Sultāns of Delhi from the time of Mu'izuddin bin Sām, the founder of the Ghūrī Dynasty, to 838 A.H., 1434 A.D. It is the most reliable and in fact the only source for the history of the first three kings of the Saiyid Dynasty from 817 A.H. (1414 A.D.) to 838 A.H. (1434 A.D.), and the accounts in the *Ṭabaqāt* and Firishtah's History are not only based on it, but in most cases are *verbatim* copies of Yahya's account. An account of this work with extracts is published in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. IV, pp. 6-88 (1872) and the entire work was issued in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series in 1931 under the editorship of M. Hidāyat Ḥosain. An English translation by K. K. Basu was published in the *Gaekwad Oriental Series*, No. lxiii, in 1932.

11. *Futūḥ-us-Salāṭīn* by 'Iṣāmī (Khwājah 'Abd-ul-Mulk 'Iṣāmī according to Ethé<sup>1</sup>) is a very important historical work in verse, from the time of Subuktigīn of Ghaznī to Muḥammad bin Tughluq. The *Futūḥ*, like the *Kitāb Zain-ul-Akḥbār*, is a very rare work and only two manuscripts<sup>2</sup> of it are known. Like the *Zain* it was first mentioned in the sources of the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī* by Niẓāmuddīn Ahmad, and it appears that the references in Firishtah<sup>3</sup> and Al-Badāonī<sup>4</sup> are only taken from the *Ṭabaqāt*. Briggs<sup>5</sup> was not personally acquainted with the work, but remarked that the *Futūḥ* is an unimportant book of historical romances.

The text<sup>6</sup> of the *Futūḥ*, based on the manuscript in the India Office Library, was issued in 1938 by Dr. A. Mahdī Ḥusain

<sup>1</sup> Ethé, H. *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office*, p. 559, No. 895 (1903).

<sup>2</sup> *Vide* page 1 of the English Preface of the text edition of the '*Futūḥ-us-Salāṭīn*' edited by A. Mahdi Husain (Agra, 1938).

<sup>3</sup> *Tārīkh-i-Firishtah* (Lucknow edition), p. 132 (1884).

<sup>4</sup> *Muntakhab Al-Tawarikh*, text edition, vol. I, p. 236 (1868).

Ranking in his translation of this volume, p. 314 (1898), note 9, remarks: "I can find no mention of this work."

<sup>5</sup> Briggs, J. *History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India*, vol. I, p. 406 (1829).

<sup>6</sup> *Vide* Note 2 *supra*.

of Āgra. In the Urdū and English prefaces of this edition the editor briefly discusses the historical and literary merits of the *Futūḥ*, while a short critical notice is published in his monographic study<sup>1</sup> of Muḥammad bin Tughluq. Prof. A. S. U'sha of Madras has also published an '*Iṣāmī Nāma* and discussed the merits of 'Iṣāmī's publications, but I have unfortunately not been able to refer to his publications<sup>2</sup>; his views have been adversely criticized by M. Ḥusain and M. Ḥaq<sup>3</sup>. A critical review<sup>4</sup> of the work is also being published in the Urdū monthly *Ma'ārif* by Ṣabāḥuddīn 'Abd-ur-Raḥmān.

*Futūḥ-us-Salāḥīn* originally consisted of about 12,000 verses, but according to the editor, only 11,524 verses were found in the India Office manuscript; of these, nineteen verses (Nos. 11294-11312) are quite illegible. The work was completed in five months and nine days (10th December, 1349-14th May, 1350 A.D.). For his sources the author does not specify any special works, but states<sup>5</sup> that he based his account on the *Ḥadīth*, various descriptive works, old legends, information gathered from friends and personal observations.

literary work of exceptional merit, and 'Iṣāmī as the best epic writer of the age.

Ṣabāḥuddīn 'Abd-ur-Raḥmān in his critical review after comparing 'Iṣāmī's accounts with some contemporary sources, such as the *Riḥla* of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, *Tārīkh-i-Firūzshāhī*, *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*, *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī* and other works, is of the opinion that most of the legends and stories in the *Futūḥ* are not based on any historical facts. The historical data of the *Futūḥ*, on the other hand, are generally correct, and, even though involved and jumbled at times, are valuable in supplying additional information and for clearing up details of several doubtful events. It is, however, not possible to adjudge the extent to which the *Futūḥ* was utilized in the compilation of the *Ṭabaqāt*.

12, 13. It has not been possible to identify the two works *Tārīkh Maḥmūdshāhī Mandrī* and *Tārīkh Maḥmūdshāhī Khurd Mandrī*. The works seem to be lost and no accounts of either beyond the references in the *Ṭabaqāt* and Firishtah's History are now available.

14. *Ṭabaqāt-i-Maḥmūdshāhī Gujarātī*. No work of this title is known, and it has not been possible to identify it with any other History of Gujarāt.

15. *Maūthir-i-Maḥmūdshāhī Gujarātī*. This is also an unknown work, but Rien in his *Catalogue*, vol. III, p. 967 (1883), has suggested its possible identity with *Tārīkh-i-Maḥmūdshāhī* of unknown authorship (manuscript No. Or. 1819, pp. 966, 967), and given full details of its contents.

16. *Tārīkh-i-Muḥammadī*. In the absence of the name of the author, and in view of there being several works of this name, it is difficult to be certain regarding the work referred to in the *Ṭabaqāt*, but if one were to hazard a guess, it seems likely that the work cited is no other than the general history, by Muḥammad Bihāmad Khānī, from the time of Muḥammad to 842 A.H. (1438 A.D.), with special reference to India, which is described in detail in Rien's *Catalogue*, vol. I, pp. 84-86 (1879).

17. *Tārīkh-i-Bahādurshāhī*. This work is referred to as a source of reference in various histories, but it has not been possible to trace it. In *Elliot's History of India*, vol. VI, p. 484 (1875), it is referred to as a work by "another individual who



wrote all the rest of the annals of Sultān Fīroz's reign, as well as those of the Gujarat sovereigns, under the title of *Tārīkh-i-Bahādur Shāhi*."

18. *Tārīkh-i-Bahamanī* is another lost work which is only referred to in several historical works, but no copies of which are now available.

19. *Tārīkh-i-Nāsirī*. The work referred to is probably the History of Mālwah entitled *Tārīkh-i-Nāsirshāhi* by an unknown author described by Rieu in his *Catalogue*, vol. III, p. 968, MS. No. Or. 1803, and not the famous *Tārīkh-i-Nāsirī* by Abū-l-Faḍl Baihaqī which was edited by W. H. Morley and printed in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series in 1862.

20. *Tārīkh-i-Muẓaffarshāhī* by an unknown author is apparently a very rare work. The only known manuscript (No. Add. 26, 279) of this history, so far I am able to find from the various sources, is preserved in the British Museum, London. It is described by Rieu in his *Catalogue*, vol. I, p. 287 (1879), as being an account of the siege and capture of Mandū by Muẓaffar Shāh II, king of Gujarāt, in 924 A.H. (1518 A.D.).

21. *Tārīkh-i-Mirzā Ḥaidar*. The correct title of the work is *Tārīkh-i-Rashidī*, but in the *Ṭabaqāt* it is cited as the *Tārīkh* of Mirzā Ḥaidar, after the name of its author. This work is of special value in connection with the history of Kashmīr. An English translation with annotations was published by N. Elias and E. D. Ross (1895).

22. *Tārīkh-i-Kashmīr*. The name of the author is not mentioned, but the work referred to in the *Ṭabaqāt* is probably the Persian translation of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* in Sanskrit which was completed by Mullā Shāh Muḥammad of Shāhābād and revised by 'Abd-ul-Qādir Al-Badāonī in 999 A.H. (1590 A.D.). A full account of the work is given in Rieu's *Catalogue*, vol. I, p. 296 (1879).

23. *Tārīkh-i-Sind* by Mīr Ma'ṣūm Bhakkari is also known as the *Tārīkh-i-Ma'ṣūmī*. It deals with the history of Sind from the Muhammedan conquest to its final absorption in the Moghul Empire during Akbar's reign in 1001 A.H. (1592 A.D.). A detailed account of it is published in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. I, pp. 212-252 (1867), and the work has recently (1938) been printed

under the editorship of Dr. U. M. Dandpota in the Government Oriental Series of the Bhundarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

24. *Tārīkh-i-Bāburī*. No work of this name can be traced and it appears as if the author of the *Ṭabaqāt* had confused one of the Persian translations of *Tuzuk-i-Bāburī* under this name (*vide infra*).

25. *Wāqī'āt-i-Bāburī*. In reference to this work also it is not possible to decide which of the Persian translations of the *Tuzuk-i-Bāburī* is referred to by the author of the *Ṭabaqāt*. The translation of Shaikh Zain or 'Zaim'ud-din of Khwaf' was made during the lifetime of Emperor Bābur (*vide* Mrs. Beveridge's *Bābur-Nāma*, preface p. xl, 1921, and Rien's *Catalogue*, vol. III, p. 926), a second one by Pāyandah Ḥasan Ghaznavī and Muḥammad Qulī Muḡhal Hīṣārī was begun in 991 A.H. (1583 A.D.) and completed in 994 A.H., 1586 A.D. (*vide* Mrs. Beveridge, *op. cit.*, pp. xliii, xliv, and Rien's *Catalogue*, vol. II, p. 799), and finally a third by 'Aḥd-ur-Raḥīm Khān Khānān, which "was made at Akbar's orders to help Abū'l-faḡl in the *Akbar-nāma*", and on its completion was presented to Akbar in 998 A.H., 1589 A.D. (*vide* Mrs. Beveridge, *op. cit.*, p. xliv, and Rien's *Catalogue*, vol. I, p. 244).

26. *Tārīkh-i-Ibrāhīmshāhī*. No work of this name is known, and appears as if *Ibrāhīmshāhī* is a *lapsus calami* on the part of the author of the *Ṭabaqāt* for *Ibrāhīmī*. The *Tārīkh-i-Ibrāhīmī*<sup>1</sup>, also known as *Tārīkh-i-Humāyūnī*, by Ibrāhīm bin Ḥarīr (probably Jarīr as suggested by Éthé) is "a general history of the world from Adam to A.H. 596 (A.D. 1199)"—see Éthé's *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the India Office*, p. 33, No. 104 (1903).

27. *Wāqī'āt-i-Mushtāqī* by Mushtāqī, commonly known as Rizq Ullah, "is a collection of detached narratives and anecdotes relating to the sovereigns of the Lodi, Timmride and Sur dynasties." An account of the work with translations of some extracts

---

<sup>1</sup> Not to be confused with *Tārīkh-i-Ibrāhīmī* which is another name for Firishnah's History, *vide* Elliot's *Bibliographical Index of the Historians of Muhammedan India*, p. 336 (1849).

is published in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. IV, pp. 534–557 (1872), while details regarding the almost unique manuscript in the British Museum are given by Rieu in his *Catalogue*, vol. II, pp. 820, 821 (1881).

28. *Wāqī'āt-i-Haḍrat Jannat Āshiyānī Hūmāyūn Bād-shāh*. By this title Nizāmuddīn Aḥmad apparently means the *Tudhkirat-ul-Wāqī'āt* by Jauhar Āftābchī, which is a useful source of reference in regard to Humāyūn's reign. Details of this work are published in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. V, pp. 136–149 (1873).

On comparing the above list with Firishtah's sources it is found that the latter gives a list of 35 main works consulted by him for the compilation of his History, while another twenty are cited in the body of the work. Of the works cited in the *Ṭabaqāt* Firishtah does not mention *Khazāin-i-Futūḥ*, *Tughluq-Namāh*, *Tārīkh-i-Nāṣirī*, *Tārīkh-i-Mīrzā Ḥaidar*, *Tārīkh-i-Bāburī* and *Tārīkh-i-Ibrāhīmshāhī*, while I have doubtfully identified Firishtah's *Tārīkh-i-Jāmī* (or *Ḥājī*) with Muḥammad Bihāmad Khānī's *Tārīkh-i-Muḥammadī* of the *Ṭabaqāt*. In addition there are twenty works which are mentioned in the body of Firishtah's *Tārīkh* and which are included in a subsidiary list by Briggs. Of these, two, *Futūḥ-i-Salāṭīn* and *Wāqī'āt-i-Mushtāqī* (? Travels of Abool Nusr Nuskatty—No. 7 of Briggs's list), are also included in the *Ṭabaqāt*. Firishtah's list includes the following additional works<sup>1</sup> which are not mentioned in the list of the authorities in the *Ṭabaqāt*:

1. *Mulḥiqāt-i-Shaikh 'Ainuddīn Bijāpurī*.
2. *Bahman-Nāmāh of Shaikh Āḍharī*.
3. *Tārīkh-i-Binakīti*.
4. *Tuḥfat-us-Salāṭīn Bahamānī by Mullā Dāūd Bīdarī*.
5. *Tārīkh-Alfī*.
6. *Ḥabīb-us-Siyar*.
7. *Tārīkh-i-Bangālah*.
8. *Fawā'id-ul-Fuwād*.

---

<sup>1</sup> For this comparison I have used the lists as given in Briggs's translation of Firishtah entitled *History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India*, vol. I, pp. xlix–li (1829). Sources of Firishtah are also discussed by Mohl in *Journal des Savants*, pp. 220–224 (1840).



*Maāthir-i-Rahīmī* by Mullā ‘Abd-ul-Bāqī Nahāvandī was composed in the year 1025 A.H. (1616 A.D.). The first volume of this work dealing with the general history of India appears, from its contents and descriptions, on almost identical lines, to be based mainly on the *Ṭabaqāt*. *Maāthir*’s style and language are superior to those of the *Ṭabaqāt*, but there can be little doubt that the historical part is only a copy of the latter. This view is confirmed by the fact that the detailed account of Akbar’s reign in the *Maāthir* ends with the 38th year of his reign; the author in this connection adds that as the narrative in the *Ṭabaqāt* ends with this year and as he has not been able to obtain any detailed history of the remaining fourteen years of the reign, he has not been able to include a detailed account of this period.<sup>1</sup>

M. ‘Abdul Muqtadir in the Preface<sup>2</sup> to the *Haft-Iqlīm* (completed 1002 A.H., 1593 A.D.) of Amīn Aḥmad Rāzī remarked that “for the Indian portion of the history he relies mainly upon the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī*”:

*Muntakhab-ul-lubāb* by Muḥammad Hāshimī, better known by his nickname of *Khāfi Khān*, is a very valuable general history of India from the Muhammadan conquest to the reign of Muḥammad Shāh, Emperor of Delhī (1719–1748 A.D.). It was published in 1145 A.H. (1732 A.D.). The author<sup>3</sup> states that Nizāmuddīn Harawī, who was one of the *Bakhshīs* of the Emperor Akbar, wrote a comprehensive history of the twenty-one *Ṣūbas* of the Deccan and included in it the history of Akbar up to the 37th year of his reign. His account of the Sultāns of the Deccan in general is not reliable, and with reference to the accounts of the Sultāns of this region the author has not come across any other historical work, except that of Muḥammad Qāsim Firishtah, which can be fully relied upon. As Nizāmuddīn had, however, been in the service of the Emperor Akbar throughout his life, his

---

<sup>1</sup> See M. Hidāyat Ḥosain’s text edition of *Ma’āsir-i-Rahīmī*, vol. I, p. 933 (1924).

<sup>2</sup> *Bibliotheca Indica* edition of *Haft Iqlīm* by E. D. Ross and M. ‘Abdul Muqtadir, p. vi (1918).

<sup>3</sup> *Vide* Kabiruddin Ahmad and Ghulam Qadir’s text edition in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series, vol. I, pp. 237–243 (1869).

narrative of the reign of this King can be fully relied upon, and he bases his account of the *Panj hazārī* and *Chahār hazārī Amīrs* and of some of the religious great men and poets on the *Ṭabaqāt*.

*Akbar-Nāma* of Shaikh Ikāhdād Faiḍī Sirhindī is, according to Dowson<sup>1</sup>, except for the account of the services rendered by his patron Shaikh Farid Bukharī and "some scraps of poetry and some wonderful stories", only a compilation from the *Ṭabaqāt* and *Akbarnāma* of Abū-l-Faḍl. It ends with 1010 A.H. (1602 A.D.), the year in which Abū-l-Faḍl's work was completed.

Various other historical works of a later date have either based their accounts on or borrowed from the *Ṭabaqāt*, but it is not necessary to deal with them here.

Of the authors in English it is only necessary to note that the *Ṭabaqāt* is regarded by Elliot, Erskine, Elliot and Dowson, Lees, Ranking, Wolseley Haig, Beni Prasad and others as "amongst the best Persian histories and the most reliable sources of our information"<sup>2</sup>.

It was the first comprehensive work which dealt with the history of India to the exclusion of the other Asiatic countries, and in which the histories of different provinces were dealt in a strict historical sequence. It must also be remembered that the author was primarily a court official, an administrator and a soldier not a *uṣūlī* or a court historian. Historical work was with him a labour of love, and being an officer with other more pressing duties, this was carried out by him with the help of his protégés under very unsettled conditions of life. His work also must not be judged by the modern standards. As Elliot admirably summed up in his learned preface<sup>3</sup>, the works of the Muhammadan historians can hardly be regarded as ranking higher than annals. "They comprise, for the most part, nothing but a mere narration of events, conducted with reference to chronological sequence; without speculation on causes or effects; without a reflection or suggestion which

<sup>1</sup> Dowson in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. VI, pp. 116-146 (1875).

<sup>2</sup> *I'de* Beni Prasad, *History of Jahangir*, p. 442 (1930).

<sup>3</sup> *I'de* Elliot, *Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Muhammedan India*, Preface, pp. v-xxx (1849).

is not of the most puerile or contemptible kind; and without any observation calculated to interrupt the monotony of successive conspiracies, revolts, intrigues, murders, fratricides, so common in Asiatic Monarchies." With the restraining influence of ostracism and even death under the despotic monarchs during whose times these histories were compiled, there could hardly be any chance for the development of individual character or the expression of unbiased opinions. In common with the authors of the times, and this was not restricted to Muhammadan authors only, Islam in the *Tabaqāt* is lauded above all other religions, the Muhammedans are of the true faith and all others are infidels; when the former are killed in battle or otherwise they drink "the cup of martyrdom", while the souls of the infidels "are despatched to hell". Patriotism and bravery of the *Kāfirs* are condemned in very strong terms, while even cowardice, intrigues, wholesale massacres and desecration and demolition of the religious institutions of the *Hindūs* are applauded. All the same the author deserves full credit for being far in advance of his times and to a great extent free from religious bigotry when he, as against *Ḍiyā Barīd*, the author of the *Tārīkh-i-Firūzshāhī*, who describes *Khusrāu Khān* on the occasion of his battle with *Ghazi Malik* "as the effeminate wretch who could not bear the attack of men", applauds him as "having with great bravery and courage fought to the end of the day."<sup>1</sup>

Similarly in narrating the chivalrous treatment of *Sultān Mahmūd* at the hands of *Rānā Sānkū* (*Sangrām Singh*, *Rānā* of *Mewār*) and restoring to him the kingdom of *Mālwa* after the former's defeat and capture by the latter, *Khwājah Nizām-uddin*<sup>2</sup> shows himself a true historian untrammelled by any religious bigotry or prejudices. In dealing with *Akbar*, his king and patron, he employs the usual eulogistic high sounding

<sup>1</sup> Vide De's translation of vol. I of the *Tabaqāt*, p. 207.

<sup>2</sup> *Tabaqāt* text edition, vol. III, p. 203 :

در فضايل اهل بصيرت پوشيده نمايد - كه كارِ رانا سانكا از سلطان مظفر  
بالا ترست - چه سلطان مظفر پناه برده را مدد نمود - و رانا سانكا دشمن را  
در حرب گرفته سلطنت داد - و مثل اين قضيه غريب تا غايت معلوم نيست \*

titles and phrases, but cannot, like Abū-l-Faḍl<sup>1</sup>, be accused of unceasing flattery, both in form and style, or of wilful concealment of facts. As a historian he casually mentions the "Divine Faith", but does not go into any great detail regarding the observances of the faith or criticize the Emperor, Abu-l-Faḍl and any of the other followers. He was writing a history of the period from personal observations and information collected from all available sources and has succeeded more than any other author of his time in producing what Dowson<sup>2</sup> rightly styles a contemporary history of very high authority.

The *Ṭabaqāt* does not exhibit much literary talent and is not written in any ornate style. The language is fairly simple and vigorous, but not grandiose and highly polished; it is more of the Afghān type which is quite different from the almost pure Persian of Irān, used by Firishtah or Mullā 'Abd-ul-Bāqī Nahāvandī, the author of *Maāthir-i-Raḥīmī*. Arabic quotations are only sparingly used, but the dates are invariably given in Arabic rather than Persian. The narrative, owing to long sentences, is often involved, rather disjointed and even fragmentary, but as few metaphors and similes are used, there is seldom any difficulty in comprehending the exact meaning of the author.

BRAJENDRANATH DE<sup>3</sup>

(1852-1932).

Mr. Brajendranath De was born at Calcutta on the 23rd of December, 1852, in his maternal grandfather's house in Simla,

---

<sup>1</sup> See Blochmann's *Ā'in-i-Akbarī* (Phyllott's revised edition), Preface, pp. vii, viii (1939); Boveridge's translation of *Akbarnāma*, vol. III, introduction, pp. xi, xii (1939), and Wolseley Haig in *Cambridge History of India*, vol. IV, p. 111 (1937).

<sup>2</sup> *Elliot's History of India*, vol. V, Preface, p. vii (1873).

<sup>3</sup> The life of the author is based on a typescript of an autobiography entitled *Reminiscences of Mr. Brajendranath De, an Indian Member of the Indian Civil Service* which was kindly placed at my disposal by his son Mr. H. K. De, Barrister-at-Law, to whom I tender my grateful thanks. A short Life of Mr. De, written by M. Hidāyat Ḥosain, was published in the *Proceedings* for 1932, pp. clxxv-clxxxvii, in *Journ. Asiat. Soc. Bengal*, vol. XXIX for 1933 (1934).



near the Cornwallis Square. His parents were *Kayasthas* and, as the author writes, belonged to "the middle class section of well-born or as they are commonly called *bhadralok* people". His mother was one of the *garhkātā* Basu families of Anarpur. His early days were spent partly in the home of his maternal ancestors and partly in his paternal home at Bhawanipur which in those days formed one of the suburbs of Calcutta. Brajendra-nath was the eldest child of the family, and though he had nine or ten brothers and sisters, all except one died in their infancy. The author remarks "it is, therefore, curious that I have lived so long, and on the whole have enjoyed such remarkably good health. I have no doubt that it is due to the fact that I have lived an abstemious, active and regular life, have taken considerable care of myself and have been more or less well-occupied." During his childhood, however, he suffered from various ailments, but he notes that he was in good health from 1862 onwards when his father migrated to Lucknow. He was very fond of religious stories and *sankirtans* (religious musical performances in honour of Krishna or Vishnu) and apparently these greatly impressed him during the early years of his life. He was a favourite companion of his grandmother, and her austere, religious and simple life greatly influenced him in his younger days.

Like all Hindu boys of the period, he had to go through what was known as the *hāte kharī* (chalk in hand) ceremony. This took place when he was 5 years old, on the 'Sripanchami and Saraswati Puja' day; the old family priest after offering 'pujas to the family Saligram and Saraswati' (the Goddess of Learning) placed a small cylindrical piece of hard grey chalk in the boy's right hand and guided him in writing the entire Bengali alphabet on the hard floor of the room where the ceremony was performed. In connection with his earlier education the author remarks, "My father had a deep-rooted antipathy equally to indigenous *pathshalas* and to missionary schools, which was perfectly justified in the case of the former, but not so well in the case of the latter; and I therefore never went to any institution of either of these classes." He was first sent to a school in Chakraberia, but soon afterwards was transferred

to the Nandan Brothers' Academy; both these institutions were located in Bhawanipur. He then migrated to a school in Chorhagan and later to the Colootolah Branch School, now known as the Hare School, and it was here that he was educated up to the Vth standard.

The migration of his father to Lucknow in 1862 to take up his appointment in Government service has already been mentioned, but the family, including the young Brajendranath, did not join him till 1865. Lucknow in those days, as the author remarks, was "in every way different from Calcutta. The men and women were differently built, more sturdy and stalwart than the puny men and women we had known in Calcutta. They were differently dressed, and spoke a different language. The houses were built in a different style . . . . .", and in fact the entire atmosphere was quite different from that of Calcutta.

At Lucknow young Brajendranath was admitted in the Canning School which later developed into the Canning College and finally into the Lucknow University of the present day; it was there that he suddenly blossomed forth into what he styles "a veritable prodigy". In spite of the fact that he was greatly handicapped by having to learn an entirely new second language, he reached the top of his class at the end of 8-9 months, and for the six or seven years during which he was at this school he was always at the top of his class. He passed the Entrance (the Matriculation) Examination in December, 1867, in the 1st division. The Intermediate Examination he passed in 1869, standing 4th in order of merit in the whole of the Calcutta University. He passed the B.A. Examination in the 1st division and, after studying for a few months more, the M.A. Examination in the 1st class in 1871.

He started studying Sanskrit for his Intermediate Examination and his fondness for this language continued unabated to the end of his life. During this period also he started learning Persian with a *Maulvī* (Persian teacher) at home, who, according to the author, was given "the magnificent monthly salary of Rs.4 for two hours' tuition every day." With this *Maulvī* he used to read various *Inshā's* or collection of letters, among which he mentions *Inshā'-i-Mādhūrām*. Even at this age

young Brajendranath was very good in languages, particularly in English, Sanskrit and Persian, but he was rather deficient in Mathematics, and in spite of hard work he was not able to make up this deficiency.

After passing the M.A. Examination and even before he had been thinking of going to England to compete for the Indian Civil Service, the authorities of the Canning College, in view of his brilliant career, recommended the award to him of a scholarship of Rs.200 a month, but the Chief Commissioner of the province turned down the proposal on the grounds of his being a Bengali and the son of a ministerial officer of the Government. The College authorities, however, awarded him a scholarship of Rs.50 a month for a period of about 6 months till he could appear in the open competitive examination for the Indian Civil Service. The family finances at the time were in none too flourishing a condition, so in the middle of July, 1872, young Brajendranath, with only Rs.1,300, sailed for England. On his arrival in London he joined the University College, and appeared in the open competitive examination for the Indian Civil Service held in April, 1873. Only 35 of the 350 candidates that appeared for this examination that year were selected for the Indian Civil Service, and Brajendranath was 17th in the list. The author attributes this rather low position to his having selected Mathematics as one of the subjects, in which he obtained very low marks; his proficiency in English, Sanskrit, Persian and Mental Science, however, enabled him to pass the Civil Service Examination and secure a fairly high place amongst the selected candidates. *En passant* it may be mentioned that he was the 8th Indian who passed the I.C.S. Examination.

Brajendranath De in the meanwhile had joined the Middle Temple Inn and was studying for the Bar. Without much work he passed the law examinations, and having kept the full complement of twelve terms, was called to the Bar. After being selected for the Indian Civil Service, he went into residence at the Oxford University, and before leaving England, in July 1875, was awarded the Boden Sanskrit Scholarship. In addition to this during the period of his probation in England he won a number of prizes in the half-yearly examinations for proficiency in

languages. At Oxford he attended the lectures of Prof. Max Müller and Mr. Ruskin, and also used to attend regularly the meetings of the Union of which Mr. H. H. Asquith (later Earl of Oxford) was the President.

On the return journey he travelled extensively on the Continent and returned to Calcutta in September, 1875. Soon afterwards he was posted to Arrah as the Assistant Magistrate-Collector, and during his service he served as a Collector in various districts of Bengal, and twice officiated as the Commissioner of the Burdwan Division. After full thirty-five years' service he retired in September, 1910, from Hooghly where he was then serving as the Magistrate and Collector.

Shortly after his return he turned his attention to the language examinations which had been instituted with a view to inducing young civilians and other officials to acquire proficiency in classical languages like Sanskrit, Persian and Arabic and the Indian vernaculars. Being a Bengali by birth and in view of his having been educated at Lucknow, he was debarred from appearing in the examinations in vernaculars such as Bengali, Hindi and Hindustani, but the examinations in classical languages were open to him. There used to be 3 examinations in each language, (1) the Higher Standard, for which there was a prize of a comparatively small monetary value, (2) the High Proficiency, for which a prize of Rs.2,000 in each language was awarded to each successful candidate, and (3) the Degree of Honour, for which there was a prize of Rs.5,000 for Sanskrit and Arabic and Rs.4,000 for Persian. He passed the Higher Standard Examination in Sanskrit and High Proficiency Examination in Persian. In the Degree of Honour Examination for Sanskrit he appeared without even passing the High Proficiency Examination and was declared successful on the very first occasion. Here it would not be out of place to mention that in connection with the Persian examinations he had to face a serious difficulty in regard to his pronunciation. As he says, "Persian is pronounced in one way by Delhi and Lucknow *Maulvis* or scholars; and in another way by the Persians themselves. I had read Persian originally in Lucknow, and I pronounced Persian as it is pronounced there." His examiners

did not consider this correct and to acquire the pure Persian accent he studied for two months with Shaikh Maḥmūd Gilānī, a famous Persian coach in Calcutta of those days. During this period he read through various text-books with the help of the learned Shaikh, and in addition studied a work called *Qaṣā'id Badar-i-Chāch* or the Odes of Badar Chāch. Brajendranath was not greatly impressed by the literary merits of this work, as he considered its language "very inflated and involved", but he read it for his examination, and this training was later useful to him in the preparation of the text and translation of the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī*.

After his retirement Brajendranath settled down in Calcutta and in view of his early love for Persian, volunteered to prepare for the Asiatic Society a properly collated edition of the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī* for publication in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series and also to translate this important historical work into English. He started this work in 1911, but, as has been remarked earlier, the publication of the work did not proceed smoothly; in fact after the issue of the first fascicles of the text and translation in 1913 the work remained in abeyance till 1925. The exact position about the end of 1924 is summed up by the author as follows: "I had commenced the work in 1911, but had given it up owing to some difference with the authorities of the Asiatic Society. I now took up the work again at the request of Mr. van Manen, the General Secretary, who sent Shamsul Ulema Manḍi Hidayat Hosain to my house to ask me to do so. I readily consented, and I have gone on with the work as quickly as the state of my health and my other occupations have allowed me to do."

In view of the rather unsatisfactory nature of the available manuscripts and the peculiar style of Niẓāmuddīn Aḥmad, the work of collation and translation of the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī* must have been not only difficult, but extremely arduous. In spite of all these difficulties and his failing health Mr. Brajendranath persevered in his task, and produced six volumes of the text and translation which will stand as monuments to his industry and scholarship. Only those who have attempted translating Persian works into English can realize the onerous

nature of such undertakings. As Ranking<sup>1</sup> rightly remarked, "The inherent differences of idiom in the two languages, the rich expansiveness of the one, and the rigid inflexibility of the other, render the attempt to fitly represent the glowing colours of Persian in the dull monotone of modern English, all but hopeless. It has been said that the test of a translation is not its literalness, but its truth; that is to say, not its fidelity to the author's expression, but its response to his inspiration. It must not merely reproduce the latter, it must embody the spirit of the original composition."

Mr. D.'s work fully conforms to these high ideals for a faithful translation, while the numerous very critical footnotes in the various volumes add materially to its importance as a work of reference. It is sad that the work could not be completed before his demise on the 28th of September, 1932, at the ripe old age of about 80 years.

The author summed up his autobiography as follows:

"I am over 76 years of age, which, considering the short-lived race and family from which I have sprung, must be considered a very great age. I have enjoyed fairly good health, and have had an active life, except during the last four or five years, when my age and the infirmities which are incidental to it, have had their usual effect on my health and my activities and energy. I am thankful however to remember that I am not bed-ridden, but can still attend to the ordinary business of life, and to my literary pursuits, such as they are. A certain amount of success has crowned my life, though, in my discontented moments, I have sometimes thought, that it has not been all that I have deserved; but I am fully aware of the limitations and deficiencies under which I have worked; and probably in this well-ordered world, no one gets more or less success than he merits. I have lost some very near and dear ones, but I thankfully remember that others are left to cheer and comfort me in my old age."

---

<sup>1</sup> Translator's Preface to the translation of vol. I of the *Muntakhab-i-tawārikh*, p. i (1898).

Mr. Brajendranath De had a charming personality. His circle of friends was wide and all who knew him respected him for his honesty, straightforwardness and gentle nature. Though rather shy and somewhat reserved, he was very generous and kind hearted, and was possessed of a subtle sense of humour.

He joined the Asiatic Society of Bengal as a Member in 1904, but retired in 1912. He rejoined the Society in 1926, and served as a member of the Council during the years 1928-29 and 1929-30. During these periods the writer of this note had exceptional opportunities of working with him as a colleague and well remembers his genuine interest in the work of the Society, particularly in its Oriental publications. He resigned his membership of the Society in 1931.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

Normally I would have started this preface with an *apologia*, but on maturer consideration I decided to leave this unpleasant infliction till the end. I have no pretensions to being either a historian or a scholar of Persian, but I must confess to having a more than usual interest for the history of my country, while from my childhood Persian has been like a second mother tongue to me. In April last when the Publication Committee of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal had to face the Augean task of resuscitating and completing several publications which had lain dormant for many years, the question of completing and editing the translation of the third and final volume of the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī* also came up for consideration. As scholars with the rare combination of an expert knowledge of Persian and English, and of Indian History are rather rare, and none with the necessary leisure to do this voluntary work for the Society could be found amongst its members or well-wishers, this work, in accordance with the couplet of Hāfiz:

آسمان بارِ امانت نتوانست کشید  
قرعۀ فال بنام من دیوانه زدند

was assigned to me. None of my critics would be more capable of disapproving this unbecoming choice, but rather than let the





the press. All this has involved a tremendous amount of work, more particularly as I could, with the responsibilities of my official position, only devote my few leisure hours to this work. In presenting the work, as now issued, I am fully conscious of its shortcomings and while craving the indulgence of my readers, only hope that in view of the circumstances explained, they will make due allowances for the defects<sup>1</sup>.

*Acknowledgments.* In preparing these volumes for the press I have been materially assisted by my friend Shams-ul-'Ulama Khān Bahādur Hidāyat Hosain, the Joint Philological Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, and I take this opportunity of offering him my very grateful thanks for the help which he gave so ungrudgingly at all times. I am also indebted to Prof. Chintaharan Chakravarti for help in connection with the revision and correction of the Sanskrit portions in the Kashmīr section of the work. My thanks are also due to Messrs. P. Knight, N. A. Ellis, and G. E. Bingham of the Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta, for assistance in connection with the printing of this work. Owing to its multi-lingual nature this work presented exceptional problems, both in type-setting and the correction of the proofs, but, as usual, the Baptist Mission Press rose fully to the occasion, and the close co-operation and ever-ready help of the gentlemen mentioned above made it possible for me to complete the publication in a little over six months. The index is being prepared under my supervision by Shāh Mu'innuddīn Ahmad, the 1st *Maulvī* of the Society, and will be issued as soon as possible.

*Museum House, Calcutta.*

BAINI PRASHAD.

28th October, 1939.

---

<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately widely different schemes for the transliteration of the names of authors and their publications are adopted by different authors. The originals are strictly followed for the citations in the foot. notes, but the transliterations in the text are, except where within inverted commas, in accordance with the scheme recommended by the International Oriental Congress of 1894.



	PAGE
SECTION III. THE DYNASTY OF 'ĀDIL KHĀN .. ..	159
1. An account of the rule of Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān .. ..	159
2. An account of Ismā'il 'Ādil Khān, son of Yūsuf .. ..	160
3. An account of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān, son of Ismā'il Khān .. ..	161
4. An account of 'Alī 'Ādil Khān, son of Ibrāhīm .. ..	162
5. An account of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān (son of Tahmāsp), who was a nephew of 'Alī 'Ādil Khān .. ..	165
SECTION IV. THE QUTB-UL-MULKIYA LINE OR DYNASTY .. ..	167
1. An account of Sultān Qulī Qutb-ul-mulk Hamadānī .. ..	167
2. An account of Jamshīd Qutb-ul-mulk, son of Sultān Qulī .. ..	168
3. An account of Ibrāhīm Qutb-ul-mulk, son of Sultān Qulī .. ..	169
4. An account of Muḥammad Qulī Qutb-ul-mulk, son of Ibrāhīm .. ..	171
SECTION V. ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF GUJRĀT .. ..	172
1. (An account of) A'zam Humāyūn Zafar Khān .. ..	173
2. An account of the accession of Tātār Khān, son of A'zam Humāyūn Zafar Khān .. ..	182
3. An account of the reign of Zafar Khān who had the title of Muẓaffar Shāh .. ..	184
4. An account of Sultān Aḥmad Shāh, son of Sultān Muḥammad, son of Sultān Muẓaffar .. ..	189
5. An account of Ghīyas-ud-duniyā-wad-dīn Muḥammad Shāh, son of Aḥmad Shāh .. ..	223
6. An account of the reign of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn Aḥmad Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh, son of Aḥmad Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh, son of Muẓaffar Shāh .. ..	226
7. An account of Sultān Dāūd Shāh, son of Aḥmad Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh, son of Muẓaffar Shāh .. ..	235
8. An account of Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh .. ..	237
9. An account of Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh, son of Maḥmūd Shāh .. ..	292
10. An account of Sultān Sikandar, son of Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh .. ..	323
11. An account of Naṣir Khān entitled Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Sultān Muẓaffar .. ..	328
12. An account of the accession of Sultān Bahādur Shāh .. ..	333
13. A narrative of Mirān Muḥammad Shāh, ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr .. ..	381
14. An account of Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh, son of Latīf Khān, son of Muẓaffar Shāh .. ..	383
15. An account of Sultān Aḥmad .. ..	394
16. An account of Sultān Muẓaffar, son of Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Latīf Khān .. ..	397
SECTION VI. THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF BANGĀLA .. ..	414
1. An account of Sultān Faḥr-ud-dīn .. ..	419
2. An account of the reign of Sultān 'Alā'-ud-dīn .. ..	420
3. An account of Ḥājī Ilyās, who had the title of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn Bangāra .. ..	421
4. An account of the rule of Sultān Sikandar Shāh, son of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn .. ..	424

	PAGE
5. An account of Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn .. ..	427
6. An account of Sultān-us-salāṭīn .. ..	429
7. An account of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn .. ..	429
8. An account of Rājū Kāns .. ..	430
9. An account of Sultān Jalāl-ud-dīn, son of Kāns .. ..	432
10. An account of Sultān Alimad, son of Sultān Jalāl-ud-dīn .. ..	433
11. An account of Nāsir the slave .. ..	434
12. An account of Nāsir Shāh .. ..	434
13. An account of Bārbak Shāh .. ..	435
14. An account of Yūsuf Shāh .. ..	436
15. An account of Sikandar Shāh .. ..	436
16. An account of Fatḥ Shāh .. ..	437
17. An account of Bārbak Shāh .. ..	438
18. An account of Firūz Shāh .. ..	439
19. An account of Maḥmūd Shāh .. ..	440
20. An account of Muẓaffar Shāh Ḥabshī .. ..	441
21. An account of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn .. ..	442
22. An account of Naṣīb Shāh .. ..	444
SECTION VII. THE SECTION ABOUT THE SHARQĪ SULTĀNS .. ..	446
1. An account of Sultān-ush-sharq .. ..	447
2. An account of Mubārak Shāh Sharqī .. ..	448
3. An account of Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqī .. ..	449
4. An account of Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Ibrāhīm Sharqī .. ..	453
5. An account of Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh, son of Maḥmūd Shāh .. ..	459
6. An account of Sultān Ḥusain, son of Maḥmūd Shāh .. ..	459
(PART II.)	
SECTION VIII. THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF MĀLWA .. ..	465
1. An account of Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī .. ..	467
2. An account of Sultān Hūshang, son of Dilāwar Khān .. ..	468
3. An account of Muḥammad Shāh, son of Hūshang Shāh Ghūrī .. ..	491
4. An account of Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī .. ..	497
5. An account of Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, son of Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī .. ..	543
6. An account of Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn .. ..	553
7. An account of Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh, son of Nāsir Shāh .. ..	574
8. An account of the rule of Sultān Bahādur .. ..	615
9. An account of the rule of the deputies of His Majesty Jinnat Āshīfānī, Muḥammad Hunnāyūn Bādshāh .. ..	616
10. An account of Mallū Khān, Qādir Shāh .. ..	617
11. An account of Shujū' Khān .. ..	621
12. An account of Bāz Bahādur, son of Shujū' Khān .. ..	628
SECTION IX. THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF KASHMĪR .. ..	632
1. An account of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn .. ..	636
2. An account of Sultān Jamshūd, son of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn .. ..	637
3. An account of Sultān 'Alā'-ud-dīn .. ..	639

	PAGE
4. An account of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, son of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn	640
5. An account of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn, son of Shams-ud-dīn ..	642
6. An account of Sultān Sikandar, the Iconoclast, the son of Quṭb-ud-dīn, the son of Shams-ud-dīn, who had the name of Sikār .. .. .	644
7. An account of Sultān 'Alī Shāh, son of Sultān Sikandar Butshikan, who had the name of Mirān Khān .. .. .	650
8. An account of Sultān Zain-ul-'Ābidīn, son of Sultān Sikandar Butshikan, which is another name for Shāhī Khān ..	652
9. An account of Sultān Ḥaidar Shāh, son of Sultān Zain-ul-'Ābidīn, who had the name of Ḥājī Khān .. .. .	672
10. An account of Sultān Ḥasan, son of Ḥājī Khān Ḥaidar Shāh ..	675
11. An account of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh, son of Sultān Ḥasan Shāh .. .. .	682
12. An account of Sultān Fath Shāh, which is another name for Fath Khān .. .. .	689
13. An account of Sultān Ibrāhīm Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh ..	696
14. An account of Nāzuk Shāh, son of Fath Shāh ..	698
15. An account of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, son of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh .. .. .	706
16. An account of the rule of Mirzā Ḥaidar .. .. .	707
17. An account of Nāzuk Shāh .. .. .	719
18. An account of Ibrāhīm Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh, who was the brother of Nāzuk Shāh .. .. .	725
19. An account of Ismā'il Shāh, brother of Ibrāhīm Shāh ..	729
20. An account of Ḥabīb Shāh, son of Ismā'il Shāh ..	730
21. An account of the rule of Ghāzī Khān .. .. .	737
22. An account of Ḥusain Khān, brother of Ghāzī Khān ..	740
23. An account of 'Alī Shāh, brother of Ḥusain ..	747
24. An account of Yūsuf Khān, son of 'Alī Shāh .. .. .	752
SECTION X. THE SECTION ABOUT THE RULERS OF SIND .. ..	761
1. An account of the Government of Jām Ānar .. ..	773
2. Jām Jūnān .. .. .	773
3. An account of Jām Malūtha, son of Jām Ānar .. ..	774
4. An account of the Government of Jām Tamāchī .. ..	774
5. Jām Ṣalāḥ-ud-dīn .. .. .	775
6. Jām Nizām-ud-dīn, son of Ṣalāḥ-ud-dīn .. ..	775
7. Jām 'Alī Shēr .. .. .	775
8. Jām Karn, son of Jām Tamāchī .. .. .	776
9. Jām Fath Khān, son of Sikandar Khān .. .. .	776
10. Jām Tughlaq, son of Sikandar Khān .. .. .	777
11. Jām Mubārak .. .. .	777
12. Jām Iskandar, son of Jām Fath Khān, son of Sikandar Khān ..	777
13. Jām Sanjar .. .. .	778
14. Jām Nizām-ud-dīn, who is known as Jām Nandā .. ..	778
15. An account of the Government of Jām Firūz .. ..	779
16. An account of Shāh Bēg Arghūn .. .. .	781

	PAGE
17. An account of Shāh Ḥusain .. .. .	783
18. An account of Mīrzā 'Isā Tarḡhūn .. .. .	784
19. An account of Mīrzā Muḥammad Bāqī, son of Mīrzā 'Isā Tarḡhān	785
20. An account of Mīrzā Jīmī Bōg .. .. .	786
21. An account of Sulṭān Maḥmūd .. .. .	786
SECTION XI. AN ACCOUNT OF THE DYNASTY OF THE SULṬĀNS OF MULTĀN	787
1. An account of Shaikh Yūsuf .. .. .	788
2. An account of Sulṭān Quṭb-ud-dīn Lankāh .. .. .	790
3. An account of Sulṭān Ḥusain, son of Sulṭān Quṭb-ud-dīn .. .. .	791
4. An account of Sulṭān Fīrūz .. .. .	798
5. An account of Sulṭān Maḥmūd, son of Sulṭān Fīrūz .. .. .	800
6. An account of Sulṭān Ḥusain, son of Sulṭān Maḥmūd .. .. .	806
BIBLIOGRAPHY .. .. .	813

(PART III.)

INDEX	817
-------	-----









# TABAQĀT-I-AKBARĪ

## ENGLISH TRANSLATION

(VOLUME III)

### SECTION I. THE SULTANS OF THE DAKIN, TWENTY-NINE PERSONS

THE <sup>1</sup> DAKINI SECTION, 29 PERSONS, AND THE PERIOD OF THEIR RULE BEGAN WITH THE YEAR 748 A.H., AND ENDED IN 1002 A.H., AND LASTED FOR <sup>2</sup> 254 YEARS.

Historians are agreed that when the sun of the greatness of Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh passed from its zenith, and declined towards its setting, there were troubles in all parts of his kingdom, the hearts of his soldiers became averse to obedience; and many rebellions were brought forth from the womb of time. The real cause of the occurrence of these rebellions was this, that the Sultān entrusted great works to men of mean and evil nature. <sup>3</sup> These men, under the influence of their greed and avarice undertook difficult tasks, and <sup>4</sup> laid unreputable deeds on the ground. As their determinations did not bear fruit, they became annoyed with men, who had any marks of greatness, and caused sorrow to the latter.

Couplet :

<sup>5</sup> To exalt the heads of the unworthy,  
To hope for good from any of them,

---

<sup>1</sup> The lith. ed. has طبعه سلاطین دکنی, which is better.

<sup>2</sup> This is the period mentioned in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. The Bahmani Kingdom however only lasted for about a century and a half. The Cambridge History of India has a list of 18 Sultāns whose reigns extended from 749 A.H. (1347 A.D.) to 931 A.H. (1527 A.D.).

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. have ان گروه.

<sup>4</sup> The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have و عملهای غیر مکرر بر زمین نهادند, the meaning of which is not at all clear.

<sup>5</sup> The first four lines were quoted in connection with the employment of base and unworthy men in the History of Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh; see page

Is utterly to lose the thread of thy actions,  
 And is like a snake, in thy pocket, to keep.  
 As on the worthless, thou placeest charges great,  
 Know that from salt land thou hop'st for fruit.

Among the most important incidents was that of 'Aziz Kham-nār, on account of whom the *amīrs Sadhā* (*amīrs* of hundreds) of Gujrat rose in rebellion, and the whole country became full of disturbances and rebellion. Sultān Muhammad advanced towards Gujrat in order to put them down. He sent Malik Lājīn (*Lāehīn*) to summon the *amīrs* of hundreds of Daultābād. As the pardoning of offences, and patience were not ingrained in the creed of the Sultān, the *amīrs* of hundreds being frightened of their awe of him, and of the wrath of his greatness, slew Malik Lājīn on the way; and going to Daulatābād seized all the property, and wealth which were in Dhārāgarh, and having blown up the dust of disturbance, raised the standard of rebellion. The details of this brief statement, have been written down in their proper places by this pen of broken writing.

In the end, during the lifetime of Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq,  
<sup>1</sup> 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan, who is celebrated as Hasan Gāngu, and was one

---

216, Vol. I, Persian text of this work. The appointment of such men and the result of such appointments were fully described in the History of Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh.

<sup>1</sup> Compare Grant Duff's History of the Mahrattas, Vol. I, page 37 *et seq.*, where it is stated that "Sultān 'Alla-ud-dīn Hoosein Kango Bahminee" (as the name is written there) "was a man of the name of Zuffir Khan" (Zafar Khān) "who had originally been the slave of a Bramin, an inhabitant of Dehli named Kango, who having discovered his merits, gave him liberty and assisted him, as well as foretold his subsequent fortune. On being raised to empire Zuffir Khan did not forget his protector and appointed him in charge of the treasury; and had the honour of giving the appellation of Bahminee to a dynasty of Patan kings". The year of the accession is there put down as 1347 A.D. See also Elphinstone's History, page 465. Firishtah, in the beginning of his 3rd section about the Sultāns of the Dakin, gives a long account of Hasan, and his gradual rise to power, of his receiving the title of Zafar Khān and finally of his accession. It will be seen that Nizām-ud-dīn omits all mention of the Brahman, who laid the foundation of, and foretold Hasan's fortune; and it will also be seen, that according to him, it was Shaikh Nizām-ud-dīn Auliya who first gave indications of his rise to sovereign power. Firishtah mentions the

of the common soldiers of that country, raised in concert with a body of low people and adventurers, the standard of government in Daulatāhād in the Deccan in the year 748; and gave himself the title of Sultān 'Ala-ud-din.

Sultān Muhammad had no opportunity of putting him down, on account of the disturbances in Gujrat; and at that very time, he died in the neighbourhood of Thathn. The currency of the rule of the Bahmanya Sultāns was on such a grand scale from the aforementioned year, which was the year of the accession of Sultān 'Ala-ud-din Hasan till the year 887, which was the date of the

prophecies of both the Brahman and of Shaikh Nizām-ud-din Auliya; but he does not refer to his alleged descent from Bahman, the son of Isfandiār. It is unnecessary here to mention the details, but Firishtah's conclusion is that "As the name of Kānku or Gāngu Bahman (Brahman) became a part of the name of Sultān 'Ala-ud-din Hasan, he has been called Bahmanī but poets and historians, who wanted to flatter him having got hold of an argument (دستاویزی) have shown the matter in a different garb." The Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 170, says Hasan's claim to descent from the half-mythical hero Bahman, son of Isfandiār, seemed to mark him out for the honour of royalty. Nizām-ud-din does in one place say that he made such a claim; but according to Firishtah it was poets and historians who manufactured this claim. The Cambridge History of India calls 'Ala-ud-din Hasan Shāh, Bahman Shāh and Sir Wolsely Haig in a paper published in the J.A.S.B. extra no. 1904 gives certain cogent reasons in support of this name. Yet it is curious that if he styled himself Bahman Shāh he should have called his capital Hasanābād and not Bahmanābād.

The Cambridge History of India brushes aside Firishtah's story about Kānku or Gāngu Brāhman as an absurd legend, yet it finds it difficult to explain the name of Kānku or Gāngu which frequently occurs in connection with the names of the Sultāns of the dynasty. It is admitted in note 3 on p. 170 that the meaning of the addition Kānku has not been established, but in p. 373, it says that it has been credibly explained by Maulavi 'Abd-ul-Wali as a scribe's corruption of Kaikāus. I have carefully read the Maulavi's short paper, and I must say with all deference to him and to Sir W. Haig that the explanation is utterly flimsy. Kaikāus was to have the final ۛ struck off and the کیکو which would be left, might be changed to Kaikān, Kankān. Kānku, Gāngu, Kāku. How Kaikāu (کیکاو) can be changed to Kānku (کانکو) or Gāngu (گانگو) and why of all the variants these should have been selected and adopted by historians neither the Maulavi nor Sir W. Haig condescend to explain. I may say that even Zia-ud-din Baranī has Hasan Kānku.

accession of <sup>1</sup>Muhammad Shāh, and which comes to a period of 139 years, that any increase over it cannot be conceived. Hasan Gāngū declared that he was a descendant of Bahman, son of Isfandi-yār, and on that account, the attribution of the name of Bahmanya to him and his descendants is not inappropriate. <sup>2</sup>And from the year 887 A.H. to the year 935 A.H. which comes to a period of 148 years, the name of Sultān has been attributed to the descendants of Bahman Shāh. But the wretched (*Be Daulat*) Barīd and his descendants had, on account of their evil spirit, kept their sovereign princes in confinement, in their house, and had themselves performed the functions of the sovereign power.

The five *amīrs*, who had been the principal nobles of the Bahmanya empire, divided the Dakin amongst themselves; and each took possession of his share, and became independent in it.

Also in the year 935, 'Imād-ul-mulk Kāveli having made his submission to Sultān Bahādūr of Gujrat, had the *Khutba* (public prayers) read and the *Sikka* (coin) struck in his own territory in the name of Sultān Bahādūr. After a year Sultān Bahādūr marched into the Deccan at the instigation of 'Imād-ul-mulk. As Nizām-ul-mulk and the other *amīrs* had not the strength to oppose him, they also read the *Khutba* in his name.

During that time, Malik Barīd, son of Barīd, had the helpless Sultān Kalīm-ul-lāh imprisoned in the city of Bidar. In the matter of the fixing of the period of the rules of the Bahmanya Sultāns, different accounts have come under my notice; but as the book (called) *Sirāj-ut-Tawārikh* written by Khwāja Muhammad Lāri during the time of those Sultāns, and from that date till to-day, namely 1002 A.H., a period of sixty-seven years, Dakin was governed by four dynasties, *viz.*, the descendants of Nizām-ul-mulk called Nizām-ul-mulkiya, the descendants of Adil Khan called Adil Khaniya,

---

<sup>1</sup> This should, I think, be Mahmūd Shāh, the period from the accession of 'Ala-ud-din in 748 A.H. to that of Mahmūd in 887 A.H. is 139 years.

<sup>2</sup> The meaning of the following sentences is not at all clear. The period is 148 years in one MS. But only 48 years in the other and in the lith. ed. The correct period from the accession of 'Ala-ud-din to the end of the reign of Kalīm-ul-lāh, the last Sultān of the dynasty in the year 935 A.H. which is mentioned in the text, is 186 years. The last five Sultāns were puppets in the hands of Barīd and his descendants.

the descendants of Qutb-ul-mulk called Qutb-ul-mulkiya, and the descendants of Malik Barīd called Malik Barīd, as I will detail later.

<sup>1</sup> Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan Shāh, eleven years and <sup>2</sup> ten months and seven days.

Sultān Muhammad Shāh, son of Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan Shāh, <sup>3</sup> eighteen years and seven months.

Sultān Mujaḥhid Shāh, one year and one month and nine days.

Sultān Dāūd Shāh, one month and three days.

<sup>4</sup> Sultān Muhammad Shāh, son of Mahmūd Shāh, nineteen years, nine months and twenty-four days.

<sup>5</sup> See note.

Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, <sup>6</sup> son of Muhammad Shāh, five months and seven days.

Sultān Firuz Shāh, twenty-five years and seven months and eleven days.

Sultān Āḥmad Shāh, <sup>7</sup> twelve years and nine months and twenty-four days.

<sup>1</sup> Compare the names and the periods of the reigns of the Bahmani Sultāns as given in a note in page 40 of Grant Duff's History of the Mahrattas. These names, the note says, were taken from Firishtah's History. Compare also Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, p. 702.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have two months. The other MS. has ten months. The date of his accession is given as August 3rd, 1347. The date of his death according to Firishtah is 1st Rabi'-ul-Āwwal, 959 A.H., 2nd February, 1358. There is one coin of his of 760 A.H. but it is believed to be posthumous. (See note 1, p. 10, which gives a summary of the history of the reign as given by Firishtah.)

<sup>3</sup> Both MSS. have eighteen years, but the lith. ed. has thirteen years. According to the Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, he reigned from 759 A.H., 1358 A.D. to 776 A.H., 1375 A.D.

<sup>4</sup> As to the correctness of this name, see note 2, p. 22. Firishtah calls him Sultān Mahmud.

<sup>5</sup> In the list given in Grant Duff's History, the name of "Sultān Ghazeeood-deen Shah Bahmani" is given as that of the sixth Sultān between Sultān Mahmud Shāh and Sultān Shams-ud-dīn. The correct name is Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn; and although it is omitted from the list in the MSS. and also in the lith. ed., a short account of his reign appears in its proper place. The name is given in the list in p. 702 of the Cambridge History of India, Vol. III.

<sup>6</sup> One MS. has "son of Muhammad Shāh" but the other MSS. and the lith. ed. do not have these words.

<sup>7</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have the period as given above in the text; but the other MS. has *وز بیست و یک سال و مدت سلطنت و یک سال*, i.e., the period of his reign (was)



*The Nizām-ul-Mulkiahs :*

Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri.

Ahmad Nizām-ul-mulk, four years.

Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk, forty-eight years.

Hasan Nizām-ul-mulk, thirteen years.

<sup>1</sup> Murtaza Nizām-ul-mulk, twenty-six years.

<sup>2</sup> Hasan Nizām-ul-mulk, son of Murtaza, two months.

Insān Nizām-ul-mulk, two years.

Murtaza Nizām-ul-mulk, who is at present the ruler, two years.

*The 'Ādil Khānias :*

<sup>3</sup> Yusuf 'Ādil Khān, seven years.

Isma'il 'Ādil Khān, twenty-five years.

<sup>4</sup> Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān, twenty-five years.

'Ali 'Ādil Khān, twenty-five years.

Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān, fourteen years.

*The Qutb-ul-mulkiahs :*

<sup>5</sup> Sultān 'Ali Qutb-ul-mulk, twenty-four years.

<sup>6</sup> Ahmad Qutb-ul-mulk, seven years.

Ibrāhīm Qutb-ul-mulk, thirty-five years.

Muhammad Quli Qutb-ul-mulk <sup>7</sup> thirty-eight years.

## AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF 'ĀLA-UD-DĪN HASAN SHĀH.

The chroniclers of events have narrated, that 'Āla-ud-dīn Hasan Bahmanī, who is celebrated as Hasan Gāngu, came to the capital city of Delhi, according to the vicissitudes of time, in the reign of

<sup>1</sup> The text is according to one MS. and the lith. ed., but the other MS. has Isma'il Nizām-ul-mulk.

<sup>2</sup> The text is according to one MS. and the lith. ed., but the other MS. has Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk instead of Hasan Nizām-ul-mulk.

<sup>3</sup> The name is Yusuf in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but it is Isma'il in the other MS.

<sup>4</sup> According to one MS. and the lith. ed. 'Ali 'Ādil Khān comes between the two Ibrāhīms, but according to the other MS. he precedes them and one Ibrāhīm succeeds the other.

<sup>5</sup> His name occurs in one MS. but is omitted from the other MS.

<sup>6</sup> He is Ahmad in one MS., Jamshīd in the other, and has no name in the lith. ed. but is simply called قطب الملك.

<sup>7</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have thirty-eight years. but the other MS. has thirty-five years.



Sultān <sup>1</sup> Tughlaq Shāh. One day the Polestar of all those who have known God, Shaikh Nizām-ud-dīn Dehlavi had issued a general invitation; and Sultān Muhammad and all the great men were present. When the table cloth was removed, and Sultān Muhammad took his leave, the Shaikh said to an attendant, "One Sultān is gone, and another is at the door: go, bring him". The attendant went outside. He saw Hasan Gāngu at the door. He took him to wait on the Shaikh. Hasan, in the purity of his faith, placed his head of exaltation on the foot of the Shaikh; and expressed his devotion. The Shaikh placed a round piece of bread on his finger, and gave it to Hasan. The bread and the Shaikh's finger took the shape of an umbrella. So that all who were present and Hasan came to know the glad tidings given by the Shaikh. Hasan in great pleasure and joy went out of the presence of the Shaikh: and accepting the joyful news, turned towards the Dakin, in concert with a body of Afghāns. When they arrived there, at that time there were disturbances in that country. Hasan Gāngu killed the <sup>2</sup> Superintendent of the city of Gulbarga, and took possession of the neighbouring tract of country. From there, he went to Daulatābād, in concert with the *Mīrān-Sadhā* (the chiefs of the hundreds). 'Alam-ul-mulk, brother of Qutlagh Khān shut himself up in Daulatābād. As Hasan was under obligations to Qutlagh Khān, he gave safe conduct to 'Alam-ul-mulk, but took possession of the property belonging to Muhammad Shāh, which was in Dhārāgarh. Then in concert with the soldiers, he placed an Afghān of the name of <sup>3</sup> Isma'il Fath on the throne of sovereignty, with the title of Nāsir-ud-dīn.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has Sultan Mubaminad Tughlaq Shāh, but the other and the lith. ed. omit Muhammad.

<sup>2</sup> There are slight variations in the readings. One MS. has میران سندنه, while the other has دگلبرگه را کشت. The lith. ed. has سندنه دگلبرگه را کشت. It appears from Firishtah that Hasan Gangu had already assumed the title of Zafar Khān, and had become well known (اختصاص یافتند) in Bakri and Rāibagh and Mirich and Kalhar Hasanābād Gulbarga and killed Bharūn Rāy, the governor of the fort of Gulbarga, who was one of the trusted servants of Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh.

<sup>3</sup> According to Firishtah Isma'il Fath was an *amīr-i-du-hazārī* (an *amīr* of two thousand horse); but Col. Briggs says "an officer of one thousand horse";

When this news reached Sultān Muhammad, he started from Bahroj for Daulatābād, in order to have his revenge. The rebels fought with him, and were <sup>1</sup>defeated. Isma'il Afghān crept into the fort of Dhārāgarh (Daulatābād?) and Hasan marched away towards Gulbarga. Sultān Muhammad Shāh halted at Dhārāgarh for some days. At this time scouts brought the news that <sup>2</sup>Taghi, a slave of Safdar-ul-mulk, had revolted in the neighbourhood of Nahrwala Pattan, had taken possession of that place, and was besieging the fort of Bahroj. <sup>3</sup>Muhammad Shāh nominated 'Imād-ul-mulk for overthrowing Hasan; and left some of the *amīrs* round the fort of Dhārāgarh; and himself marched towards Gujrat. Hasan by such <sup>4</sup>machinations, as he could employ, defeated and slew

---

and he was also the younger brother of Malik Gul Afghān (Col. Briggs calls him Mallick Mough) who was one of the great nobles of Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh, and had a large army for the defence of Malwa, who would, if it became necessary, assist and aid his brother. It does not appear that all the *amīrs* of the Dakin agreed to Isma'il Fath's being made the Sultān; for Firishtah says, "That all the *amīrs* of the Dakin, whether they liked it or not (*khwāhī na khwāhī*) agreed to make Isma'il Fath Afghān, Nāsir-ud-dīn Shāh; and held the umbrella of sovereignty over his head". The Cambridge History of India says that the man whom Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah call Isma'il Fath has been called Mukh, Mugh and Fath, but it has followed the Bibliotheca Indica text of Baranī and called him Isma'il Mukh the Afghān. Baranī however calls him only *مغ افغان* which may be transliterated Mukh or Mukh Afghān.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah says that Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq was joined on the way to Daulatābād by 'Imād-ul-mulk Tabrizī, his son-in-law, and governor of Berar, and Malik Gul Afghān; and he describes in some detail the varying fortunes of the battle. He also says that after the battle, the rebel leaders decided that it would not be advisable to have another drawn battle; and that Nāsir-ud-dīn should remain at Daulatābād with a sufficient force to defend it; and Hasan should remain in possession of Gulbarga with twelve thousand men. Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh besieged Daulatābād; and the garrison was reduced to great straits, when the news of the revolt of Taghi came from Dehli.

<sup>2</sup> The name is Taghi in the MSS., and in Firishtah. The lith. ed. has wrongly *ظفر*, Zafar.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has the word "Sultān" before "Muhammad Shāh", but the other MS. and the lith. ed. omit it.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah does not mention any machination or treachery. He says that Hasan Gūngu met 'Imād-ul-mulk near Ahmadābād Bidar. For twenty days neither army felt strong enough to attack the other; but 'Ala-ud-dīn having

'Imād-ul-mulk. He then went to Danlatābād, and placing the umbrella (of sovereignty) over his own head, assumed the title of Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn. Sultān Muhammad considered the overthrowing of Taghī of primary importance, and did not turn his attention to the suppression of the disturbances in the Dakin. And during the course of that year, he was united with the Divine mercy in the neighbourhood of Thatha; and the empire was settled on Hasan without a dispute and an enemy. He gave the name of Hasanābād to Gulhargā, and made it his capital.

<sup>1</sup> After a time he fell ill, and when he had no hope of living longer, he gave advice and direction to his son, Muhammad Khān,

---

received reinforcements of fifteen thousand infantry from the Rāj of Telingana, who was aggrieved with Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq, and of five thousand horsemen from Nāsir-ud-dīn attacked 'Imād-ul-mulk. The battle was well contested and lasted all day. In the end victory declared itself for 'Ala-ud-dīn; and 'Imād-ul-mulk was killed.

<sup>1</sup> Nizām-ud-dīn does not give any account of the events of 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan Shāh's reign. It appears from Firishtah that he proclaimed himself as Sultān on Friday, the 24th Rabi'-ul-Ākhīr, 748 A.D., corresponding with Friday, August 3rd, 1347 A.D. Firishtah goes on to say that one of his first acts was to send for Gāngā Brāhman, and to place the account office of his kingdom (*daftar-i-muhasibā-i-mumalik Mahrūs-i-ikdād*) in his charge. He also combined the name of the Brāhman with his own by styling himself, "the smallest of the slaves of the holy Presence 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan Gāngā Bahmani". He brought the neighbouring territories under his rule, took possession of the fort of Bidar and Kānd'har from the officers who were in charge of them under Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh by peaceful means, and restored the Jāma' Masjid and the fort of Gulbarga which had become dilapidated. Then he heard of the death of Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh, and becoming assured of there being no further danger from him, set about to make his rule permanent. He married his son to the daughter of Malik Saif-ud-dīn (Ghūrī) with great pomp. It appeared that when the marriage festivities were going on, his wife expressed her sorrow that at such a time, her sister, the aunt of the prince, could not be present. The Sultān inquired where she was, and found that she was in Multan; so without telling her anything, he sent men to bring the lady; and protracted the marriage festivities for seven months, till the old lady was brought, in a *duli*, to the great joy and surprise of the queen.

After the marriage festivities were over, Isma'il Pāthi, who had at one time been raised to the throne as Nāsir-ud-dīn Shāh, but had afterwards been made *amīr-ul-umra* and *sipah-sālār* became disaffected, because Saif-ud-dīn (Ghūrī) was given precedence over him. 'Ala-ud-dīn put him to death, but as he had

and accepted the summons of death. The period of his reign was eleven years and two months and seven days.

Verse :

No one doth live in this garden for aye,  
Each one for a moment doth in it play,  
In it, each moment a new fruit doth grow :  
One goes away, and another arrives.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN MUHAMMAD SHĀH,  
SON OF 'ALA-UD-DĪN HASAN SHĀH.

When the term of rule came to Muhammad Khān, he sat in the place of his father, and assumed the title of Sultān Muhammad Shāh.

promise I, did not punish any of those whom he had got to enter into a conspiracy with him; and also did not punish his son or any other relation of his, but maintained them in their rank and position. The Rāy of Tilang, who had before this been inclined to be refractory, now became submissive and sent the tribute, which he had formerly sent to Delhi. 'Ala-ud-dīn then made most grandiose proposals for the conquest of all the surrounding country: but later modified them on the advice of Malik Saif-ud-dīn Ghūrī. He sent an army to the Karnatik, which looted and devastated the country, and brought immense quantities of booty and tribute. He also extended his territory as far south as the Tungabhadra. He then started for Malwa and Gujrat, and sent Shāhzāda Muhammad with twenty thousand horsemen in advance. When the prince arrived at the town of Nausūri, he found the forests full of wild animals and began to hunt them. He also sent information to his father, and the latter went and joined in the hunt. There he had fover; in spite of which, he indulged in wine and *kabūb* of the meat of the animals killed. He became seriously ill and returned quickly to Gulbarga. There he obtained absolution from the hand of the Sadr-ush-sharīf Samarqandī; and then divided his kingdom into four parts and placed them in charge of four nobles. He was ill for six months, during which time he occupied himself in doing justice to the poor and oppressed among the people. He also ordered the release of all convicts, except six, about whom he left directions with his son. He died on the 1st Rabī-ul-Āwwal, 759 A.H., corresponding with the 2nd February, 1358. The Burhān-i-ma'sir gives 761 as the year of his death and says he reigned for thirteen years, ten months and twenty-seven days, but these figures are not accurate.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah's account of the reign of Muhammad Shāh contains a lot of matter which have not been referred to at all by Nizām-ud-dīn, and I consider it unnecessary to mention it here. It appears however that the gold and silver coins of the Bahmani Sultāns were being melted down in large quantities

He was a young man, adorned with (a sense of) justice and equity. The people were happy and contented during the period of his rule ;

by the Hindus of Bijānagar (Vijayanagar) and Warangal ; and numbers of the Hindu merchants were put to death to put down this practice. In connection with the conquest of "Bilampatan", it appears however that Sultān Muhammad sent much treasure to Mecca and Medina with his mother. This gave rise to some dissatisfaction among the nobles, and the Rāy of Bijānagar, coming to know of this, sent ambassadors, demanding that all the territories as far as the river Krishna and all the forts and pargannas in it should be left in his possession. The Rāy of Tilang, who had ceded Kūlās as a tribute to Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan, also at this time sent ambassadors with the message that his son Nāgdeo had rebelled against him, and was demanding the recovery of the fort of Kūlās, and it was advisable that Sultān Muhammad should restore it to him instead of having recourse to warfare. Sultān Muhammad kept the ambassadors on various pretexts, in his capital, for a year and half : and during that time he destroyed all the *amīrs*, about whom he had any suspicion, and collected those who were loyal to him. He then sent for the ambassadors at a great *majlis* and directed them to write at once to their masters to send elephants loaded with gold and gems and other presents to the Sultān. The ambassadors sent reports to their masters. When the Rāys of Bijānagar and Tilang received these reports, the latter sent his eldest son Nāgdeo (his correct name appears, according to Sowell's "A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar", p. 31, to have been Vinūyaka Deva; Col. Briggs calls him Vinnik Dew) from Warangal with a large army of infantry and cavalry towards Kūlās : and the former sent twenty thousand horse and foot to reinforce Nāgdeo's army. The Sultān sent Bahādur Khān, son of Isma'il Fath, whom he had made his commander-in-chief, with the armies of Bidar and Borar against Nāgdeo. The latter was defeated and his army fled. Bahādur Khān pursued him as far as Warangal, and returned with much booty.

Then one day, towards the end of the year, when the Sultān was seated on a *kursi* (chair ?) and making his ablutions, it was reported to him that some merchants had brought horses for sale. The Sultān at once sent for them, and inspected the horses, but found that they were not good enough for his use. On asking the merchants, they said that they were bringing fine horses for the Sultān, but Nāgdoo who was at "Wailampatan" as deputy of his father had taken the horses intended for the Sultān, in spite of their protests. The Sultān was greatly annoyed, and immediately mounted a horse and went out of the city. He stayed there for ten days apparently to collect the forces, and then started on his march. When he arrived at Wailampatan he sent a body of Afghāns in the guise of merchants. They went to the gate, and complained, that they had been attacked by robbers, and their merchandise had been looted. While they were thus engaged, the Sultān came to the gate and entered the

and the country of Dakin, became, on account of the peace (which it enjoyed), and the gathering together of the great men, the envy of all the country of Hindustan; and there was a fresh splendour in the affairs of the state. Applying all his energies to the conquest of territory, and the reviving of the customs of religious warfare (jehād), he in the spring-time of his reign, and in the beginning of his grandeur, collected a well-equipped army and started for Bilampatan, and in the course of the march, he seized many villages and towns

---

I have not been able to identify Bilampatan or Wailampatan. Gulbarga and Watangan and Culhan or Kulhan which last is mentioned by Firishlah as having been passed by the Sultan on his march to Bilampatan are in the map. It appears from Mr. Sewell's "A Forgotten Empire - Vijayanagar", p. 31, that Villumpattan which according to Mr. Sewell is how the name, as given by Firishlah, should be spelled, and Filumpatan, according to the author of the *Burhān-i-Mu'asir* was the city (capital) of the Raya of Warangal. Mr. Sewell does not mention the story of the horses; but according to him, apparently, Muhammad reached the capital of Warangal in the first expedition. The Sultan "commanded a pile of wood to be lighted before the citadel and putting Nāgdeo in an engine (catapult), had him shot from the walls into the flames in which he was consumed."

Mr. Sewell, as far as I can see makes no attempt to identify Wailampatan. In a note on page 302, Vol. II of his "Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India" Col. Briggs, however, makes such an attempt. He says he knows of no place of this name (Wailampatan). "Vilum Conda or Bellum Conda (the sugar hill) was the seat of government of a powerful Raja nearly two centuries afterwards, and perhaps Bellum Conda ought to be the true reading. The terminations of pattan (town) and conda (a hill) being frequently used synonymously, if the town lie under a hill, as it does in this case. One principal objection to this surmise however arises from the towns of Kawlās and Kullian which are here mentioned, not lying on the nearest road between Koelbarga and Bellumconda."

belonging to the enemy, and included them in his own kingdom. The Rāy of that country, being proud of the strength of his fort, shut its gates on himself. The *amīrs* and soldiers having arranged the necessary appliances for the conquest of the fort, commenced hostilities; and with Divine help and heavenly aid, seized the citadel, and carried out the practices of slaughter and taking prisoner. After this victory, the Sultān made arrangements for the government of that neighbourhood, and returned to Gulbarga; and having arranged a great festival, granted to every one a share from the board of his benefactions.

It so happened that one day a messenger came from <sup>1</sup> Badhūl and reported to the Sultān, that the Rāy of Bijānagar had come

<sup>1</sup> The readings are different. One MS. has از بدھول رسیده, coming or arriving from Badhūl. The other MS. has از دھول رسیده coming from Dhūl, but in the next line we have بر ولایت بدھول on the country of Badhūl. So that بدھول Badhūl appears to be the correct reading. The lith. ed. has بدھول پور رسیده, having arrived at Dhūlpūr. This is clearly incorrect. I cannot find any place called Badhūl in a map. There is a place called Mudhal to the south of the river Krishna about half way between Bijānagar or Vijayanagar and Gulbarga or Koolbarga, but a long way to the west of the line connecting them, which may be the place. I cannot find any mention of the place in Firishtah, but there is a story there about Sultān Muhammad having sent an order (*Barār*) for the payment of certain musicians to the Rāya of Bijānagar. I cannot understand the meaning of this proceeding unless it was meant to be an insult for provoking hostilities. The order was given, according to Mulla Dāūd of Bidar, who was seal bearer to Sultān Muhammad (as quoted by Mr. Sewell, page 33) in a festive assembly, "when the spring of the garden of mirth has infused the cheek of Muhammad Shāh with the rosy tinge of delight," or to use somewhat less romantic language, when he was flushed with wine. The order was so extraordinary that the minister hesitated to despatch it. The Sultān however penetrated his thoughts and compelled the minister to send it.

The Rāya who was proud of his power became angry, and paraded the man, who carried the order, mounted on a donkey all round the city of Bijanagar and immediately collected thirty thousand horse and nine hundred thousand foot soldiers and three thousand elephants for the conquest of the Bahmani kingdom. He established a camp in front of ادنی Udni (Adoni in the map). Sultān Muhammad ordered the army of Daulatābād to assemble (those of Bidar and Berar being exhausted with the campaign against Tilang) and after proper religious observances set out to oppose the Rāya of Bijānagar. The latter

by rapid marches, with a large body of horse and foot to the country of Badhūl, and had seized the fort and made martyrs of the Mussalmans

---

being assured of safety owing to the Krishna being in flood was engaged in besieging the fort of Mudkal (Madgall in the map N.-W. of Adoni). The fort was at last taken, and all the garrison was put to the sword, except one man who concealed himself and who escaping from the fort and crossing the Krishna, went and gave information to Muhammad Shāh at Hasanābād Gulbarga. I have stated in an early part of this note that Badhūl may be identical with Mudhal: but from the context of both the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah Mudkal is more likely to be identical with Badhūl.

Firishtah's account of the conquest of Mudkal is different from that of Nizām-ud-dīn. Ferishtah begins his account by saying that Sultān Muhammad on hearing what the fugitive had to say, ordered the poor man to be put to death; the reason given by him, being that he could not bear the sight of a man who has seen the death of so many men. He started at once and when he reached the bank of the Krishna, after some bragging about his own greatness, he said that he was not afraid of the river in flood, or of the grandeur and might of the infidel army. He sent back his son, who afterwards became Mujāhid Shāh, to Gulbarga, making him his heir; and with only twenty elephants and nine thousand horsemen he crossed the river in the course of three days. The Rāy, in spite of his having such an immense army, was so astounded and perplexed by the Sultān's crossing the river, that he sent back all his troops in the darkness of the night: and remained *jarida* (alone or with a small retinue), so that he might decide in the morning, whether he would fight or not. When the news of the retreat of the Rāy's army became known in the Sultān's camp, he left it and everything behind, and with horse and whip started for the enemy, who fled at once, leaving everything behind. When the Sultān arrived at the Rāy's camp he gave an order for a general massacre, and seventy thousand persons, men and women, and young and old, and slaves and free men were put to the sword. He passed the rainy season in Mudkal, and having received reinforcements, started towards the fort of Ūdnī (Adoni). Firishtah has a great deal more about further conquests in Bijānagar, but as there is no reference to them in the Ṭabaqāt, I refrain from noting them. But it may be briefly stated that the Sultān seized Adoni, and after much more fighting, and much more slaughter of Hindus, in which neither women nor babes at their mothers' breast escaped, laid siege to Bijānagar itself; but although he tried his best for about a month he was unsuccessful. He then had recourse to the stratagem, which according to Nizām-ud-dīn he had used at the time of the siege of Badhūl or Mudkal. He throw himself on the bed of weakness, and the commanders of his army conducted it back across the Tumhandra (Tungabhadra) river, and arrived on a level plain, where they halted. Kishan Rāy, the Rāy of Bijānagar who is however called Bukka I, in Sewell's "A Forgotten Empire"



there. Immediately on hearing this, the Sultān collected an immense army; and set forth to punish the Rāy. The latter on receiving information of the vast multitude of the Sultān's army, fled and took shelter in a strong fort. The Sultān sat down round the fort for some days, but when he saw that by doing so, the hand of his hope would not reach the skirt of success, he made an invalid of himself (*i.e.*, pretended that he had fallen ill) and returned towards Gulharga. When he had crossed the Krishna, the Rāy opened the gates of the fort, and gave his men leave to go to their respective places. The Sultān, making Divine help the vanguard of his army, made a rapid march of eighty-one *karohs*, and presented himself in the neighbourhood of the fort; and with great activity and smartness fought with and defeated the Rāy; and much booty, in which were included eight thousand prisoners, fell into his hands. The Sultān then returned to Gulharga, crowned with prosperity and success; and made the people happy by his benefactions.

A long time had not elapsed after this, that swift messengers brought the news, that <sup>1</sup> Bahrām Khūn and Govind Rāy had placed

also encamped at a distance of three or four *karohs*. The Sultān then convened a *majlis*, but still feigning illness left it early. He then sent for his commanders in secret, and ordered them to array the army for battle. At midnight he joined the army, and advanced towards the Bijānagar camp; where the Rāy and his commanders, presuming on the Sultān's illness were engaged in drinking and looking at the dancing of Nautch-girls. When they became aware of the Sultān's approach, they were completely helpless, and the Rāy fled, and did not draw rein till he arrived at Bijānagar. There the people reviled and reproached him; and he at their instance sent emissaries to the Sultān to sue for peace. The latter was at first unwilling to grant their request, but demanded that his original demand for the payment of the musicians should be complied with. The emissaries at once agreed, and in fact there and then paid the amount. Then at the request of the emissaries, the Sultān said that hereafter he would never order the massacre of prisoners and the general slaughter of the people. After this he returned to his capital.

<sup>1</sup> Nizām-ud-din does not say anything about the cause of the rebellion of Bahrām Khūn and Govind Rāy; but it appears from Firishlah, that owing to the Sultān's having feigned to have fallen ill, before Bijānagar, the report of his death became published all over the kingdom; and there being no leading men in the country of Daulatābād, the leaders of the army being at Bijānagar, Bahrām Khūn Māzandarānī, whom Sultān 'Ala-ud-din Husan had given the

their feet outside the bounds of the road of obedience, and had scratched the face of loyalty and devotion, with the finger nails of hostility. Upon this he started by successive marches towards Deogarh, and when he arrived in the neighbourhood of that place fear came in the hearts of Bahrām Khān and Govind Rāy; and they immediately went to Shaikh Rukn-ud-dīn, who was one of the great Shaikhs of the age, and behaved with great meekness and humility.

---

name of son, and Kumbh Deo Marhata sardār rose in revolt. The Govind Rāy of the Ṭabaqāt may be the Kumbh Deo of Firishtah; and in fact Col. Briggs calls him Govind Deo Maratta. The Cambridge History of India, Vol. III. p. 382. calls him Kondba Deva. Deva is pure Sanskrit, but I do not know what Kondba is: I should think that Kumbha Deva or Govinda Deva more likely to be correct than Kondba Deva. According to the Cambridge History of India, Bahrām Khān resented the succession of Muhammad, and invited Firūz Tughlaq to recover the Deccan; and although he failed in this, he now rose in rebellion, as he felt stronger owing to Muhammad's armies being engaged in the south. There is no mention in the Cambridge History of any intercession by any pious Shaikh. On the approach of Muhammad the rebels dispersed and fled, and were pursued to the frontiers of Gujrāt where they took shelter. Firishtah's account of the rebellion is much longer and more elaborate; and the end is also different. The Shaikh to whom the rebels went is there named Zain-ud-dīn (Col. Briggs calls him Shaikh Ein-ood-deen), and not Rukn-ud-dīn; and he did not intercede with the Sultān for their pardon; but told them to escape to Gujrāt; and they went there. The Sultān pursued them but being unable to seize them, returned to Daulatābād, in great anger. He then sent word to the Shaikh, with whom he was already angry, because he had not made his submission to him, like the other Shaikhs, at the time of his accession, because he drank intoxicating liquors and did other things, not allowed by the law of the Prophet, either to appear before him, or to send a writing containing his submission. The Shaikh refused to do either. Then the Sultān ordered him to leave the city. The Shaikh, taking up his few belongings, went and sat down at the *rouza* (tomb) of Shaikh Burhān-ud-dīn, and challenged all and sundry, to move him from the place, if they dared. The Sultān now became repentant and he and the Shaikh exchanged civilities; and the Sultān went back to Gulbarga after receiving the title of Ghāzī from the Shaikh. Firishtah goes on to say that after this, the Sultān shut up all shops for the sale of intoxicants; and ordered that all robbers and turbulent people should be put to death; and accordingly in the course of six or seven months not one of them was left alive; and according to Mullā Dāūd Bidārī, the heads of about twenty thousand of them were brought into Gulbarga.



Be not secure that this turbulent stream,  
Hath forgotten its habit of devouring men.

The period of his reign was eighteen years and seven months.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF MUJĀHID SHĀH.

He was the son of Muhammad Shāh. After the latter's death he <sup>1</sup>succeeded him. He continued to maintain the praiseworthy qualities and the good attributes of the former Sultāns. He made the supporting and cherishing of his *raiyyats* and the giving of justice his special habits; and fully maintained generosity and liberality and manliness. In the first spring of his reign he marched towards <sup>2</sup>Bijānagar. When he crossed the river Krishnā some of

---

<sup>1</sup> It appears from Firishtah that he was nineteen years of age when he ascended the throne.

<sup>2</sup> According to Firishtah, Mnjāhid Shāh wrote to the Rāy of Bijānagar, that the territory and the forts between the rivers Krishnā and the Tungābhadrā were held jointly by them; and there were, therefore, many disputes between them. It would, therefore, be better if the Rāy would cede that territory to him. The Rāy did not agree, and said that the whole of the tract had from ancient times belonged to Bijānagar, and should be left in his possession. Mujāhid Shāh then collected his army, and crossing the Tungābhadrā laid siege to Udni (Adonī). He left Safdar Khān Sistānī to carry on the siege, and marched quickly towards *pargana* Kankawatī, where he was informed that Kishan Rāy (according to Mr. Sewell his real name was Bukka I) was encamped.

The people informed the Sultān of a ferocious and man-eating tiger that infested the jungle there, and he, with only seven companions, entered the forest, on foot, and when the tiger made its appearance, he told his companions to do nothing, and with his first arrow he shot the animal dead. This so frightened Kishan Rāy, that although he had a large army, he fled into the trackless forests (Mr. Sewell says the forests in the valley of Sandūr), and the Sultān pursued him for six or seven months. Then Kishan Rāy and his sons fell ill. He said he had been wandering about in the forest, because he had thought that the Sultān would fall ill, but instead of that he himself had fallen ill. He then went to Bijānagar and fortified himself. The Sultān left his commanders, to carry on the siege of Bijānagar, and himself went on to Setban (Setubandha) Rāmesar (the site of the bridge built by Rāma); and there he repaired a mosque, which Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn Ikhājī had built; and demolished the idol temples. As regards this see Sewell, pp. 41, 42, and also notes in Briggs' History, II, pp. 332, 333.

On returning to Bijānagar, he seized the city; and demolished the great golden temple ornamented with gems. Then a great battle took place, and

the inhabitants of the country represented to him, that there was a tiger in the neighbouring forests, which was desolating those parts. Muġāhid Shāh went to hunt the animal, and with the strength of his arm killed it. After that, he ravaged a portion of the country of Bijānagar, and obtained much booty. Kishan Rāy, who was the

Kishan Rāy was nearly defeated, when his brother arrived with a fresh army of eighteen thousand horsemen and six lakhs of foot soldiers. These are the numbers in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*, but Col. Briggs has twenty thousand cavalry and a body of infantry. The battle was renewed but the Sultān was unable completely to conquer the kingdom. He therefore retraced his steps and came to Ūdnī (Adonī).

When the Sultān was attacking Bijānagar his uncle Dāūd Khān had been left with six thousand horse and some infantry to occupy a post called *Dahna-i-Sodra*, or the mouth of the defile of Sodra. It appears from Sewell that this was the way of approach to the city along a narrow and difficult road, which approached along the valley of the Sandūr, or along the valley which now carries the main road from Bellāry to Vijayānagar, between the Sandūr hills, and the hills that surround the latter city. Col. Briggs calls the place Dhuna Sodra. I now quote from Col. Briggs: "On hearing that the engagement began at dawn, and the onemy were not yet defeated, perceiving also that re-inforcements were joining them at every instant, he (Dāūd Khān) became alarmed of the safety of the king, and quitting his station joined in the battle, in which he behaved with surprising gallantry. He had three horses killed under him, and was frequently obliged to fight on foot. The king on seeing the standard of Dāūd Khān was far from pleased, but stifled his resentment, till victory declared for the faithful. He then called Dāūd Khān before him, and gave him a harsh reprimand for quitting his station."

On arriving at Ūdnī (Adonī) he found that his officers were still besieging it. He also was unable to capture it. So a sort of treaty was concluded and the Sultān continued his journey. At Mudkal he left the army behind, and with four hundred companions went to Raichūr (Rāichore). There he occupied himself with hunting. He sent back Safdar Khān Sīstānī and Ā'azam Humāyūn Sīstānī to their respective governments of Berar and Daulatābād. Dāūd Khān, who was grieved owing to the Sultān's having abused him (this is also mentioned in the *Ṭabaqāt*), conspired with Masnad 'Alī Khān Muhammad and Masa'ūd Khān, who had grievances of their own; and Dāūd Khān entered the pavilion in which the Sultān was asleep at night, after he had crossed the river Krishnā, and had been engaged in fishing in the river during the day, and with the help of Masa'ūd Khān slew him. This happened on the 17th Zi-hijja, 779, April 4th, 1378. Mr. Sowell makes the date April 16th. The period of Sultān Muġāhid's reign did not extend to three years.

leader of the rebels, came out of the citadel, and surrendered the fort, and made submission the stronghold of his honour.

<sup>1</sup> At the time of the return, scouts brought the news that some turbulent men had taken shelter on the top of a high hill, which was in that neighbourhood, with much wealth and treasure in their possession. The Sultān marched in that direction, and left Dāūd Khān, who was the "son of his uncle (*i.e.*, cousin) on the road, by which those men would be likely to try to escape: and himself engaged in plunder and pillage. After the division of the booty, he reprimanded Dāūd Khān by word of mouth, as he found there had been negligence and carelessness on his part, in guarding the road of escape of the turbulent men. Dāūd Khān nourished malice and hostility in his heart, conspired with a number of his intimates, and when they had all crossed the river Krishnū, he one night entered the private pavilion of the Sultān, and slew him with his dagger. The period of Mujāhid Shāh's reign was one year and one month and nine days.

#### A NARRATIVE OF THE REIGN OF DĀUD SHĀH, "SON OF THE UNCLE OF MUJĀHID SHĀH.

After the assassination of Mujāhid Shāh, <sup>1</sup> Dāūd Khān, who was the son of his uncle, took his place on the throne of sovereignty, and

<sup>1</sup> The real cause of the enmity of Dāūd Khān and the manner of the assassination, and the length of Mujāhid Shāh's reign are given differently by Firishlah. See the latter part of the last note. According to the list of the Bahmani Sultāns given in a note in page 40 of Grant Duff's "History of the Mahanayas," Mujāhid Shāh succeeded his father in 1374, and was assassinated by his uncle in 1377, so that he reigned for three years, and the period mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn although it is so definite is not correct. According to the Cambridge History of India, Vol. III, also Mujāhid Shāh reigned from 776 to 779 A.D., 1375 to 1378 A.D. or for about three years. Dāūd Khān was a son of Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan, and so he was an uncle of Sultān Mujāhid Shāh, and not a cousin.

<sup>2</sup> See note 1. He was an uncle and not a cousin of Mujāhid Shāh.

<sup>3</sup> See the preceding note.

<sup>4</sup> There are slight differences in the readings. The new Sultān is called simply Dāūd in one MS. and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. he is called Dāūd Khān. I have affixed Khān to his name. Then one MS. says he took his seat on the *ارايکه سلطنت و مسند ايات*. The other MS. has *ارايکه سلطنت*

the seat of greatness. Most of the *amīrs* and the great men of the country agreed with him. The sister of Mujāhid Shāh bound the girdle of hostility and the belt of enmity, in retaliation of the murder of her brother; and tempted some of the *amīrs* by gifts of money. On a Friday, in the Jāma' Masjid they wounded Dāūd Shāh. He was carried to the palace, while there was still a little breath left in him. Then the brave men of the two parties and the warriors of the opposite sides came out armed and equipped for strife and battle; and in the end the enemy (the party who had assassinated Dāūd Shāh ?) were defeated; and the city was devastated. When the news of this reached Dāūd Shāh, he gave the word of acceptance to the summoner of God. The period of his reign was one month and <sup>1</sup> three days.

<sup>2</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN MUHAMMAD SHĀH,  
SON OF MAHMŪD, SON OF BAHMAN SHĀH.

The rule of the country of the Dakin was in the grasp of his power for a period of nineteen years. Nothing that may be worthy

اورنگ ایالت و while the lith. ed. has ارایکه ایالت only. I have adopted the second reading.

<sup>1</sup> The account of the reign of Dāūd Shāh, as given by Firishtah, does not differ much from that given in the text. Firishtah, however, says, that the *amīrs* did not at first all unite in acknowledging him. There were two parties; one on the side of Dāūd Shāh, while the other was in favour of Sultān Mahmūd Shāh—the youngest son of Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan; but Malik Nāib Saif-ud-dīn Ghūrī had the public prayers read in the name of Dāūd Shāh, in spite of the opposition of the sister of Mujāhid Shāh, who bore the name of Rūh Parwar Āgha. She persuaded a young man of the name of Bāka, who had been high in the favour of Mujāhid Shāh, on account of his sincerity and bravery, to avenge his patron's murder; and he agreed to devote his life in the attempt. On Friday, the 21st of Muharram, 780 A.H., May 19th, 1378 A.D., he slew Dāūd Shāh in the Jāma' mosque, and was himself cut down by Masnad 'Alī Muhammad Khān. According to Firishtah, Dāūd Shāh reigned for one month and nine days. According to the list in the note on page 40 of Grant Duff's History of the Mahrattas, he reigned for about one month. It is said there also that he was assassinated at the instigation of Roopurwur Agah.

<sup>2</sup> The history of the reign of Muhammad Shāh, which extended to nineteen years, is given by Nizām-ud-dīn in a few lines. Apparently he knew very little

of mention has come under my notice among the particulars connected with him. Towards the end of his life <sup>1</sup>the *thānadār* of

about the history of the reign. Even the name is incorrect, the correct name according to Firishtah being Sultān Mahmūd Shāh; but see note 2 in page 47 of Sewell's "A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar", from which it would appear that the name on all the coins of this Sultān is Muhammad (Dr. Codrington, Numismatic Chronicle. 3rd series, Vol. XVIII, page 261) and not Mahmūd; and this is confirmed by the Burhān-i-Ma'āsir and two other authorities (Major King, in Indian Antiquary. July, 1899, page 183, note 39) so that, after all, Nizām-ud-dīn is right and Firishtah wrong. But the Sultān's relationship with the previous Sultān was probably not known to Nizām-ud-dīn. According to Firishtah he was the youngest son of Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan, the founder of the dynasty; and Mr. Sewell also says that he was 'Ala-ud-dīn's youngest son. But according to one MS. of the *Ṭabaqāt* he was the son of Mahmūd, son of Bahman Shāh; and according to the other he was the son of Mahmūd, son of Shāh Bahmanī; and according to the lith. ed., he was the son of Mahmūd, son of Husain Shāh. The name of Bahman Shāh (incorrectly Shāh Bahmanī) supports the statement made by the Cambridge History of India that the founder of the dynasty styled himself Bahman Shāh. The Husain Shāh of the lith. ed. is of course a mistake for Hasan Shāh. As I am not translating Firishtah's history, it is not necessary for me to go through the whole of the history of the reign, as written by him, which extends over nearly three quarto pages of closely printed lithograph. I can only refer to such portions of it as will explain the one fact, which is mentioned in a very doubtful form, at the end of Nizām-ud-dīn's account.

<sup>1</sup> I have taken this from Firishtah. The readings in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. are doubtful. One MS. has *تهاندار قلعه شکر اور باغي بود شد*; the other has the same reading, but omits the word *بود*, which is clearly superfluous and incorrect. The lith. ed. has *تهاندار قلعه دار اورا باغي شد*. What really happened, according to Firishtah, was that Bahā-ud-dīn, son of Ramzān Daulatābādī, became a favourite of the Sultān, and was made the *Thānadār* and governor of the fort of Sāghir. He had two sons, Muhammad and *Khwāja*, who acquired much power, and became the object of much envy and malice. People complained of them to the Sultān, and although he did not believe the accusers, Muhammad and *Khwāja*, thinking that they were suspected, revolted; and forced their father to join them. They defeated two armies sent against them. A third army was sent under Yūsuf Azhdar, and in the course of its operations, an arm of Muhammad was cut off by Saiyyad Muhammad Kālapahār, an officer of the Sultān's army, in a single combat. *Khwāja* also came out of the fort and the two brothers remained outside. Then the men in the fort sent a message to Yūsuf Azhdar to the effect that they would cut off the head of Bahā-ud-dīn and open one of the gates of the fort; and he should



the fort of Sāghir rebelled against him; the Sultān marched against him; and defeated him. In the course of the same journey he took the way to the other world. He reigned for a period of nineteen years and nine months and twenty-four days.

### <sup>1</sup>AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN GHİYĀS-UD-DIN.

Ghiyās-ud-din sat on the *masnad* of sovereignty in the place of his father, on the 7th Rajab; and all the *amīrs* and the attendants

---

send a body of chosen men to the gate, when he would be able to capture the fort. In accordance with this plan the fort was seized. The reference to Sāghir or Sāgar as it is called in the Cambridge History of India is brief and, I venture to think, slightly confused. It is said there that Muhammad II imprisoned Khān Muḥammad, who had been a general in the service of Muhammad I, but who had afterwards been Dāūd's principal supporter, in the fortress of Sāgar, where he shortly afterwards died, and punished his accomplices.

The account of Bahā-ud-dīn's rebellion in Sāghir is given in the *Tabaqāt* agrees practically with that given by Firishtah. A short time after this the Sultān died of fever on the 21st Rajab, 799, April 20th, 1396; and his reign extended according to Firishtah to nineteen years, nine months and twenty days. According to the Cambridge History of India, Muḥammad II was a man of peace and a lover of poetry and literature. At the instance of the Sadar-i-Jahān Mīr 'Ināyettullah of Shīrāz he invited the great poet Hafiz to come to his Court. Hafiz started but he was so alarmed by a storm in the Persian Gulf that he went back to Shīrāz. The Cambridge History of India also says that there was a great famine in the Deccan between 1387 and 1395; and describes the relief measures as displaying a policy of combination.

<sup>1</sup> There is not much difference in the readings in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. There is also not much difference between the accounts given by Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah. Of course, the latter gives more particulars and details. The name of the Turki slave, who engineered the transfer of the sovereignty, appears according to Firishtah to have been Taghachūn. Col. Briggs calls him Lallehin; Mr. Sowell does not give his name, but describes him as an ambitious slave. He was dissatisfied, because other nobles had received high dignities and he had been left out in the cold. He had a very beautiful daughter, who was highly skilled in Indian music, and the Sultān was greatly enamoured of her. The latter accepted Taghachūn's invitation with alacrity, because he expected that his host would offer his daughter as *Peshkash* or tribute, and in the same hope, he ordered all his attendants to leave the place, at the instance of his host. The latter went into the *zenana* as if to bring his daughter; and after a little while, came back with a naked dagger in his

of the Sultān, and the commanders of the army placed their heads of fealty on the ground of service. It happened, however, that a slave of his father, of the name of Taghalji, who had been honoured, by increase of dignity, and proximity in rank, wanted that the sovereignty should be transferred to another brother (of the Sultān). In order to carry out this resolution, he arranged a great feast, in the course of which he imprisoned the Sultān; and on the 17th of Ramzān, 799 A.H., he drew a pencil over his world-seeing eyes: and raised Sultān Shams-ud-dīn on the throne. The period of Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn's rule was one month and twenty days.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN SHAMS-UD-DĪN, BROTHER OF SULTĀN GHIYĀS-UD-DĪN.

As <sup>1</sup> Sultān Shams-ud-dīn sat on the *musnad* of sovereignty, by the exertions of Taghalji the *amīrs* and the great men made their submission to him, but the two <sup>2</sup> Shāhzādas Firuz Khān and Ahmad

---

hand. The Sultān, who was a lad of seventeen, and was more or less intoxicated made a struggle for his life, and tried to escape. Taghalchīn caught him by the hair of his head and rooted out his eyes, with the point of his dagger. He then sent for the nobles and the attendants of Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn, on the pretext that the latter was calling for them; and as they appeared, one by one, murdered 24 of them; and he then sent for the younger brother of Ghiyās-ud-dīn, who was called Shams-ud-dīn, and who was a lad fifteen years of age and placed him on the throne. Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn was kept in imprisonment, for two months, in the fort of Sāghir. It does not appear what happened to him after that.

The account of Ghiyās-ud-dīn's short and tragic reign as given in the Cambridge History of India does not differ materially from that given above. The man who blinded and imprisoned Ghiyās-ud-dīn is described in it as Taghalchīn the chief of the Turkish slaves, and the cause of his anger is said to have been Ghiyās-ud-dīn's refusal to appoint him Governor of Gulbarga and lieutenant of the kingdom.

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishlah, Sultān Shams-ud-dīn was only Sultān in name, and all the power was in the hands of Taghalchīn, who had received the title of *Malik Nāib*, and the rank of *Amīr Jumlayī* or the *amīr* in charge of everything.

<sup>2</sup> These were sons of Sultān Iltūṭ Shāh. The Cambridge History of India says they were sons of Ahmad Khān one of the younger sons of Bahman Shāh. According to Firishlah they were only six or seven years of age when their father was killed; but Sultān Mahmūd had had them properly trained

Khūn then attempted to regain their hereditary dominion; and commenced to gain the *amīrs* over to their side. Sultān Shams-ud-

and had given them his daughters in marriage, and up to the time that he had no sons, had said that he would make prince Firūz his heir. Afterwards Sultān Mahmūd directed them to be loyal and faithful to his son and heir, Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn; but when Taghālchīn blinded and imprisoned Ghiyās-ud-dīn, the wives of the two princes, who were the sisters of the blinded Sultān, incited them to avenge the outrage committed on the latter. On the other hand Taghālchīn incited Sultān Shams-ud-dīn and the queen mother to seize them. Then they fled to Sāghir; and Sidhū, the governor of the place, did everything in his power to help them. They were still faithful to Sultān Shams-ud-dīn; and wrote to him, telling him that they were not hostile to him, but they only wanted the punishment of Taghālchīn. The Sultān, however, incited by Taghālchīn and the queen mother wrote a reply, which could only inflame their enmity. They then raised three thousand horse and foot and advanced towards Gulbarga, with the hope that the troops there would come and join them; but when they came to the river Pithora (that appears to be the name in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*, but Col. Briggs calls it the river Beema) no one joined them. They held a consultation; and afterwards proclaimed Firūz Khān to be the Sultān, and again advanced towards Gulbarga. Then there was a battle with Sultān Shams-ud-dīn's troops in the neighbourhood of Marqul (Col. Briggs calls it Morkolo); and Firūz Khān and Ahmad Khān were defeated, and retired towards Sāghir. The parties of Taghālchīn and the queen mother became stronger than ever; but the people of Gulbarga were dissatisfied with them, and sent word to Firūz Khān and Ahmad Khān that they should get an agreement from Sultān Shams-ud-dīn and come to Gulbarga; and when a suitable opportunity occurred should accomplish their object. At this time a '*Dirānah Kashmiri*' (a Kashmiri man) came from Gulbarga and called Firūz Shāh by the name of Rūz-afzūn Shāh and said he would take him to Gulbarga and make him *bādshāh*. Taking this to be a happy omen the princes started for Gulbarga and arrived there. Both Firūz Khān and Taghālchīn were suspicious and afraid of danger, and took great care of themselves. Then on Thursday, the 23rd Safar 800 A.H., November 15th, 1397 A.D., Firūz Khān entered the *Darbār* attended by twelve *silādārs* (armed men); and then by a sudden *coup* he imprisoned Shams-ud-dīn and Taghālchīn and ascended the *masnad*, and took the title of Sultān Rūz-afzūn. Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn was brought from the fort of Sāghir, and in spite of his blindness, he slew Taghālchīn who was placed before him, with one blow of his sword. Sultān Shams-ud-dīn was blinded and he and his mother were allowed, at their own request, to go to Mecca. He is said to have lived there for many years, and during his life-time Firūz Shāh made him a liberal allowance of five thousand golden *ashrafis* and also

din attempted to seize them; and they fled to the fort of Shakar (according to Firishtah, Sāghir). The *thānadār* there was a slave of the name of Sādhū. He considered the advent of the Shūhizūdas to be a matter of advantage and gratitude, and supplied all that they wanted. Firūz Khān then collected troops and advanced for war. Sultān Shams-ud-din gathered an army, and came out of the city. After the troops had been arranged in battle array, Sultān Shams-ud-din fled; and did not halt anywhere till he had gone to the city (Gulbarga). Firūz Khān, owing to the purity of his faith, and the goodness of his nature, took the path of peace and procrastination, and came to the Sultān. But it became patent after a few days, that the Sultān breaking his agreement with him and his brother Ahmad Khān, wanted to seize them. Then Firūz Khān forestalled him, and had three hundred well-armed men concealed in his house, under the charge of his brother Ahmad Khān. He himself went to the palace, and as he found that the royal seat was unoccupied, he made bold, and going up to it, sat down on it. As the people were on his side, those who were present in the assembly, placed their heads of fealty on the ground of service. About the same time Ahmad Khān arrived there with the three hundred armed men. Those who were on the side of the Sultān (i.e., Shams-ud-din) left the assembly and dispersed. The Sultān concealed himself; but after some days he was seized; and, according to another statement, was slain. The throne of the empire was adorned with the grandeur of the accession of Firūz Shāh. The period of the reign of Shams-ud-din was five months and nine days.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN FIRŪZ SHĀH.

Sultān Firūz Shāh was a *bādshāh* of great splendour and magnificence and vigour and learning and wisdom. He sat on the throne of grandeur on <sup>1</sup>Thursday, the 24th Safar 800 A.H. <sup>2</sup>In the splendid

---

sent him annually rich clothes. This differs greatly from Nizām-ud-dīn's statement, that he was imprisoned, and according to another statement put to death.

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishtah (see last note) the 23rd Safar was Thursday; so the 24th was Friday.

<sup>2</sup> Nizām-ud-dīn is rather vague and indefinite in his laudation of the virtues of Firūz Shāh. Firishtah is more precise. He gives him credit for

period of the days of his rule, the laws of generosity and the customs of truth and honesty and the foundation of justice and equity became stronger. And all sections of the people had peace and comfort under the wings of his justice and beneficence.

Couplet :

His justice, by the sword, did clean the page  
Of the time, from the signs of falsehood and pain.

In difficult affairs and troublesome matters his mind sought the help of those who sat in privacy in corners, praying in humility and tribulation. He himself also in his prostrations and risings prayed for assistance in his victories from the great Holy God. Therefore of a necessity in whichever direction he turned the bridle of his attention, the breeze of victory and triumph blew on the plumes of his standards.

As all matters connected with his government were properly regulated after his accession, he made the conquest of Bijānagar the

bravery and activity, and says he was engaged in twenty-four campaigns, for extending his kingdom, and for his generosity: but he says he was addicted to the drinking of wine, to the listening of music and to women. He made excuses, and said that music elevated his soul to the contemplation of God: and wine did not create a disturbance in his mind. As to women, he took the opinions of learned men; and as Mir Fazl-ul-lah Ānjū told him that in the time of the Prophet, *Mutā* (temporary) marriages were allowed, but the Sunnis did not allow them, while the *Imāmiyas* or *Shiās* did. Firūz Shāh following the *Shiās* received "three hundred females" according to Col. Briggs "in one day": but the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* says that eight hundred women were introduced into the *harem* in the course of one month. *Firishtah* also says that Firūz Shāh married a princess of the Bijānagar family: and that this was the first time such a marriage took place. The Cambridge History of India says "Firūz at the time of his accession was an amiable, generous, accomplished and tolerant prince, possessed of a vigorous constitution and understanding, both of which he undermined by indulgence in the pleasures of the harem."

<sup>1</sup> *Firishtah* does not mention the rebellion, or of the rebels fortifying themselves in the fort of Shakar or Sāghir, as *Firishtah* calls it, as we have already seen; but he says that when Sultān Firūz, on hearing that Deo Rāy of Bijānagar had invaded his kingdom, marched from Gulbarga to Sāghir, he seized one of the *zamīndārs* of Sāghir, who was a bold and reckless *kāfir*, and had a force of seven thousand or eight thousand Hindūs (Kolis), and had him put to death. The Cambridge History of India calls it a rebellion of the

object of his (martial) spirit. As some refractory people had taken up a position in the fort of Shakar, he turned in the first instance, to punish them. Immediately on hearing the news of his advance, the

Kelī headed by a Hindū chieftain on the north bank of the Krishnā. Firishtah also says that when Sultān Firūz was still at Sūghir, news was brought that Nar Singh Rāy the ruler of the fort of Kehrā (Walī Qila'-i-Kehrā, the Hindu kingdom of Keralā or more properly perhaps the Rājā of Kehrā as Col. Briggs describes him, had invaded the country of Berār and plundered and devastated as far as the fort of Māhūr and had caused much insult and loss to many Mahādāns; and that he had done this at the instigation and with the aid of the rulers of Mandū and Ash (i.e., the Muhammadan kings of Mālwa and Khūndesh), and also at the instigation and motion of the Rāy of Bijānagar. The Sultān had, therefore, to send back the mages of Berār and Daulatābād to redress these matters; and he himself started for the Krishnā with twelve thousand horsemen. The invasion by the Rājā of Kehrā has not been mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn; but the Cambridge History of India agrees with Firishtah. It calls the Rājā of Kehrā, Nar Singh the good Rājā of Kherlā.

Firishtah does not say that Firūz Shāh wanted to conquer Bijānagar. On the other hand he has a great deal to say about the Sultān's *harem*, which contained nine ladies from Arabia, nine from 'Ajam, besides ladies from Turkey, Frang (Europe), Khitā (China), and Afghānistān and Rājputāna and Bengāl and Gujrat and Tilnag and Kanāra and Mahratta. These ladies had attendants from their own countries, so that they might conform to their own customs, and speak their own languages; and the Sultān conversed with every one of them in her own language.

Firishtah also says that according to various historians he carried on *ghazā* (religious war) with the *kāfirs* twenty-four times, that Mulla Dāūd Bidarī, and the author of the *Sirāj-ut-tawārīkh* have described some of them in detail; but he does not himself mention particulars of any of them. Then he goes on to say that in the year 801 A.H. Deo Rāy of Bijānagar invaded the Doab of the Tungābhadrā and the Krishnā with a large army for the conquest of the forts of Mudkul and Rūchore and some of the *parganas* in their neighbourhood.

Mr. Sewell, see page 50 of his "A Forgotten Empire", says that there was peace between Bijānagar and the Bahmaṇī kingdom during the reign of Hariharā II of Vijayanagar; and then he quotes the passage from Firishtah about the invasion of the Doab in 801 A.H. He places the movement of the Hindū army at the beginning of the cold season of 1398 A.D., probably not later than December of that year. The Hijri year 801, extending from 13th September, 1398 to the 3rd September, 1399. Mr. Sewell thinks that Hariharā II was too old to lead the invasion himself, and that it was probably a bold dash made by his son Bukka II, who afterwards succeeded him towards the end of 1399, with his permission.

rebels fled and concealed themselves in nooks and corners. The Sultān leaving the *dārogha* (apparently the officer-in-charge of the government), proceeded by successive marches, and encamped on the bank of the river Krishnā. But as it was impossible to cross the river at that time, there was necessarily a delay there. The Rāy of Bijānagar came with a great army, and took up a position on the other side of the river. The Sultān was very anxious and distressed, on account of these obstacles and delays; and had frequent consultations with the loyal *amīrs*. Then one day <sup>1</sup> Qāzī Sirāj, who was one of his special advisers and friends, and had very great reputation for bravery and cleverness informed him that the solution of this problem could only be effected by having recourse to trickery and deceit; and this slave (*i.e.*, he himself), with some of his companions, on whom he had complete faith and reliance, would in any way that may be possible, cross the river and reach the Bijānagar army. Let a noble order be issued that the men should arm themselves and be ready. The easiest way would be that <sup>2</sup> *pushtwāras* should be made of wood and grass, and placing the necessary furniture and things on them, he and his companions would cross the river; and as soon as there would be a great noise and uproar in the army of

It would appear, therefore, that instead of what Nizām-ud-dīn says about Firūz Shāh's martial spirit inciting him to invade Bijānagar, he was only compelled to march towards Bijānagar to repel the invasion of Bukka II.

<sup>1</sup> The Cambridge History of India calls him Qāzī Sirāj-ud-dīn and describes him as an inferior officer of the Court.

<sup>2</sup> The word is *پشتواره* in the MSS. and *پشتاری* in the lith. ed. They were I suppose some kind of rafts or basket boats. In the corresponding passage of Firishtah, it is said that "two hundred *sabads* (baskets), which in the idiom of the people of the Deccan were called *Naukras* covered with cow-hides were made ready". In Scott's Firishtah, page 76, they are called hurdles covered with leather, but Col. Briggs calls them baskets; and he says in a note (Vol. II, page 371) that "the same sort of basket boats, used in the Tigris, in the time of Herodotus, are still employed there, and are almost the only description of passage boats known in the Indian Peninsula, at this day, to the natives of the country. A detachment of the British army crossed its heavy guns, without even dismounting them over the Toonghudra in 1812 in these basket-boats".

the enemy, order should be given that the <sup>1</sup>soldiers should without any hesitation cross the river. There was hope, that the beautiful form of victory and triumph should appear <sup>2</sup>in the mirror of their purpose and aim.

The Sultān having accepted this counsel, Qāzī Sirāj with seven other men crossed the river, and mingled with the army of the Rāy of Bijānagar. <sup>3</sup>They took up their quarters in the house (or quarters) of the musicians. As the Qāzī had great skill in the art of music, and showed some of the finer and subtler points of the art to the musicians, after a few days, when the Rāy of Bijānagar held a great festival, and summoned all the musicians, the Qāzī and his companions also went to the *majlis* with the other musicians. After the Rāy of Bijānagar and the other Rāys had become intoxicated, the Qāzī showed some feats, the like of which the Rāy had never seen in his life; and everyone acknowledged the superiority and mastery of the Qāzī in the art. The latter having waited for a suitable opportunity plunged his poisoned dagger into the malevolent breast of the Rāy, and tore it open; and his companions, also, drawing their daggers out off the heads of the other Rāys. When the shouts

<sup>1</sup> It would appear from the Qāzī's plan, and the success which attended it, that it was not so much the tumultuous waters of the Krishnā that the Sultān's army was afraid to cross, as it was the fact of having to cross the river in the face of a strong and vigilant hostile army; for as soon as the Qāzī, by assassinating the Rāy and his commanders threw that army into disorder, the Sultān's army had no difficulty in crossing the river.

<sup>2</sup> The words in one MS. and in the lith. ed. are در انبه مراد; in the other MS. they are مراد و مطلوب.

<sup>3</sup> The account of what the Qāzī and his companions did is given in much greater detail by Firishtah; and there are also many differences in matters of detail, which it is not necessary to mention here, except that according to Firishtah, the Qāzī and one of his companions entered the *majlis* having assumed the female garb, ogling and smiling and dancing and playing on the *mandals*; and making no doubt very grotesque figures of themselves. One matter of detail is however of very considerable importance, namely that it was the Rāy's son and not the Rāy himself, that was holding the *majlis* and that it was the Rāy's son that was assassinated. This is confirmed by Mr. Sowell also, who says that after his son had been murdered, "Bukka reached Vijayanagar in safety, and took refuge behind its fortifications".



and uproar of the Hindūs reached the Sultān, he in his own person crossed the river. He made that crowd, without a head, food for the sword, and those who escaped the sword were carried off as slaves. So much booty fell into his hands, that the accountant of time found it difficult to make a note of it all. The Sultān made Fālād Khān governor of that sūba, and returned to his capital. There he arranged a great festival, and made all the well-known *cris* happy by his favours and great rewards. The <sup>2</sup>grand assemblage and the festivities for the conquest of Bijānagar had not yet been concluded, that a messenger came from Badhūl, and submitted the report, that Deo Rāy had on account of his great pride and hauteur sent an army of three hundred thousand infantry to that neighbourhood, for the following reasons, viz., that he had

---

received information, that there was a <sup>1</sup>maiden in those parts, who had the shape and form of a *parī*, and the face like the full moon, and who had no rival under the blue dome of the sky; and his men had, after much search and investigation, had to return disappointed

<sup>1</sup> As to the beautiful maiden, Firishtah, on the authority of Mullah Dāūd Bidari says, that she was the daughter of a goldsmith who lived in a village in the neighbourhood of the town of Mudkal. Mr. Sewell apparently on the authority of Firishtah makes her the daughter of a farmer living in the town of Mudkal; but both the lith. ed. of Firishtah and Col. Briggs say that she was the daughter of a goldsmith living in a village near Mudkal. According to the lith. ed. of Firishtah her name was *پرتھال*, Parthāl and Mr. Sewell calls her Parthāl, but Col. Briggs gives her the name of Nehāl. Her parents, following the customs of the country, wanted to betroth her in her girlhood to a youth of her own caste, but she prayed that the ceremony might be delayed, with such earnestness, that they consented. Then a Brahman, who was returning from Benares saw her and was struck with her beauty. He taught her music and dancing, and then went to Bijanagar, and went to the Rāy. According to Mr. Sewell the reigning Rāy was Bukka II's successor and brother, Deva Rāy I, who began to reign in November, 1405 A.D. On hearing the Brahman's account of the girl's beauty and accomplishments, the Rāy sent him back with rich gifts to bring the girl, and her parents to Bijanagar. The parents were overjoyed, but when they attempted to throw a beautiful jewelled necklace, which the Brahman had brought, around her neck, and the wearing of which would be the mark of her betrothal, she with tears besought them to desist, and told them, that if she became a *Rānī* of Bijanagar, she would never again be allowed to see them or any of her other relations. Her parents acceded to her tearful requests, and the Brahman had to go back disappointed to Bijanagar. The maiden afterwards told her parents that she had long had an inward conviction, that she was destined to be the wife of a prince of the faith of Islām; and asked them to await the will of Providence. Nizām-ud-dīn does not say so, but it may be mentioned here, in passing, that she afterwards became the wife of Hasan *Khān* the son of Sultān Firūz, who did not, however, succeed him.

On hearing the Brahman's account of the failure of his mission, the Rāy was much annoyed. He at once marched out with an army, and on reaching the bank of the Tungābhadrā, sent five thousand selected horsemen across the river to march to Mudkal; and to bring the maiden and the whole of her family with them, but without doing them any injury. As the Rāy had not sent the Brahman back, to apprise the family of the maiden of his intention, they like all the other villagers fled to distant places and the troops had to return unsuccessful. They, however, devastated the country; and when Fūlād *Khān*, after collecting his army opposed them, they outnumbered his men, and he had to fall back.

and discouraged. When this news had reached Fūlād Khān, he had at the time of the return of the Bijānagar army obstructed their passage; and had sent many of them to their real place (*i.e.*, hell).

After receiving the information of these occurrences, the Sultān sent a special robe of honour and Arab horses to Fūlād Khān; and himself turned his attention to the punishment of Deo Rāy. He marched by successive stages with a large army, and passed into the kingdom of Bijānagar. He stretched his hands to ravage and devastate the country; and so much plunder came into his hands, that it was beyond the bounds of estimation. After plundering the country, he advanced to the fort (of Bijānagar); the approaches to which were extremely narrow. Although the *amīrs* and the loyal servants of the Sultān pointed out, that it was not advisable for him to enter them, he did not listen to them: but relying on his high destiny, and the assistance of heaven, he penetrated into them; and when he arrived close to the fort, he arranged his troops, and placed himself in the centre of the line. Deo Rāy also came out of the fort with nine lakhs of infantry, and arranged them in front of the Sultān's army. As the numbers of the enemy exceeded the estimate, Sultān Firūz commenced the engagement in his own person, and made blood to flow in streams, from the enemy's army. He galloped about in the battle field, and challenged warriors of the hostile army to single combat. Suddenly an arrow from the bow of fate struck his hand; but <sup>1</sup> tying up the wound, he stood firm on the field of bravery and the plain of heroism. The Khān Khānān, Shāhzāda Ahmad Khān, who was the commander of the vanguard, also performed feats of valour.

When the world-illuminating sun bound the black veil over his bright forehead, the drum of return was beaten, and the army took up its former position. The next day <sup>2</sup> Sultān Firūz Shāh

<sup>1</sup> The words in the MSS., as well as in the lith. ed. are برو پاک بسته. I cannot make out the meaning of برو پاک. According to Firishtah the Sultān did not show any distress, but drew out the arrow with his own hand, and, without dismounting, tied up his arm.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah says that the Sultān's plans were more extensive and far-reaching. He sent the Khān Khānān with ten thousand horse to lay waste the country to the south of Bijānagar, and sent Mīr Fazl-ul-lah Ānjū Shirāzī to take

devastated and ravaged the country surrounding the fort; and for some days was engaged in measures of pillage and destruction, and the whole country was laid waste. Then Deo Rāy with (great) humility sent an ambassador, and prayed for the pardon of his offences, and making promises of loyalty sent much tribute, consisting of elephants of the size of mountains, and various kinds of fabrics and stuffs. The Sultān, on account of his innate kindness accepted his excuses, and turned his bridle for his return.

As Firūz Shāh's heart was always engrossed with the conquest of new dominion, he marched with a well-equipped army for the conquest of the Marhatta country, at a moment which the astrologers declared to be auspicious. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Mahūr, the *thānadār* there offered many fine and beautiful presents.

the fort of Bankāpūr, one of the most celebrated fortresses of the Karnātik. The *Khān Khānān* returned with sixty thousand prisoners and much plunder; and Bankāpūr was captured. It was then decided that the *Khān Khānān* should be in charge of the operations against Bijānagar; and the Sultān and Mir Fazl-ul-lah should march against Adoni. Deo Rāy then sent some of his chiefs to sue for peace. The Sultān at first refused to listen to his prayers; but at last agreed to the following conditions: viz., that the Rāy should give one of his daughters in marriage to the Sultān, besides, much money and pearls and elephants and thousands of slaves. The marriage was celebrated with great pomp and splendour; but, in the end, the Sultān was offended because the Rāy did not accompany him all the way to his camp, when he returned to it, at the end of the marriage festivities. So in spite of the alliance there was still enmity between them. The Sultān then returned to his capital.

<sup>1</sup> Firishlah places this campaign in 802 A.H. 1399 A.D., long before the war against Bijānagar, which took place in 809 A.H. The campaign, according to Firishlah, was also of longer duration. Narsingh Rāy the Rājā of Kehrlā (Nizām-ud-din calls him Harsingh Rāy) met the Sultān's army, at a distance of two *mauzils* or stages from his capital (Col. Briggs says two *coss* from Kehrlā); and there was a severe conflict, and the Sultān's army was at first beaten, and it was reported that the *Khān Khānān* had been slain. Mir Fazl-ul-lah, however, fought bravely; and he was joined by the *Khān Khānān*; the Hindūs were defeated and Kosal Rāy (called Gopāl Rāy by Col. Briggs) the son of Narsingh Rāy was taken prisoner. Kehrlā was then besieged, and after two months the garrison being reduced to great distress, Narsingh sued for peace, which was soon concluded; Narsingh Rāy giving one of his daughters, in marriage, to the Sultān, and also valuable presents including 45 elephants and a large sum of money.

He then traversed many stages, and arriving at Kehrlā (the ancient Kerala), laid siege to that fortress and devastated the country all round it. Harsingh Rāy the Rāy of Kehrlā, having with great humility, made his submission petitioned for the pardon of his offences; and bringing some valuable presents, gems and gold, and twenty <sup>1</sup> chains of elephants came to render homage; and presented the keys of the forts. The Sultān gave him a seat in front of the throne, and having given him Arab horses and a gold embroidered robe and a jewelled belt gave him permission to go back (to his capital).

Returning from there, after a few days, he sent bodies of men to different parts of his dominions to collect the revenue; and the men, who were sent, brought after a time immense quantities of treasure and elephants and gold and gems.

<sup>2</sup> At this time also, the engineer of his thoughts planned a city on the bank of the river, into all the houses in which there should be running water. After it had been finished, he gave it the name of Firūzābād. He built a noble mansion, the turrets of which raised their heads and claimed rivalry in altitude with the stars, for his own palace.

<sup>1</sup> The word is سلسله, *Silsila* a chain. I have never seen it used before, with reference to elephants. The expression for an elephant is *ek zinjir fil*. *Silsila* probably is synonymous with *zinjir*. A *halqa* of elephants is the collective name for one hundred elephants.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah mentions the building of Firūzābād, but the date of the building of the city cannot be ascertained. From what is said in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, it would appear that Firūz Shāh's love for fair women had something to do with the building of the city. It is said there سلطان فیروز شاه چون بزنان پری طاوس زیب رغبت تمام داشت شهری بر کنار تهر نیوره موسوم بفیروز اباد بنا کرد Col. Briggs, however, does not say anything of the kind. He simply says, "Firūz Shāh built a town on the bank of the river Beema". Neither Firishtah nor Col. Briggs says anything about the flowing water being brought into all the houses; but they say that a canal was brought from the river into the fort, and along this, kiosks were built for the ladies. It may be mentioned here, that the palace at Firūzābād was, later on, allotted by Ahmad Shāh, the next Sultān, to Hasan Khān, the indolent and lotus-eating son of Firūz Shāh.

<sup>1</sup> And about this time, news came that <sup>2</sup> Amīr Saiyyad Muḥammad Dīsh-darāz, who was one of the holy men of the age, and among the disciples of Shaikh Nasir-ud-dīn Muḥammad Dāḡlī, was coming from the direction of Dehli. His Majesty the Sultān was highly pleased and happy on account of the grandeur of the noble advent of that great Saiyyad, and went forward to welcome him. After having the pleasure of meeting him, the Sultān suggested that as that country had now become illuminated by the reflection of the sun of his grandeur, he hoped that the shadow of the safety conferred by his presence should continue to be spread over the people of the country. His holiness the Saiyyad acceded to the prayer, and took up his residence in the city of Gulbarga.

Faiztuh goes on to say, that the Sultan sent word to the Saiyyad that his residence was too near the fort (palace); and there was always a great crowd there; and that he should therefore go out of the city. The Saiyyad had to comply with the order, and he took up his residence outside the city, where his adherents soon erected a fine house for him, at the spot where his tomb now stands. Col. Briggs adds in a note, that the tomb now standing was either

<sup>1</sup> It is said that one day, Sultān Firūz Shāh had his eldest son, who bore the name of Hasan Khān, arrayed in a special dress, and made him his heir. He then took him with himself to his holiness the Saiyyad; and informed the latter that as he had selected the prince to be his heir, he hoped that his holiness should cast an eye (of favour) on his affairs and should not withdraw the hand of his training from over his head. The holy Saiyyad declared, that the fashioner of providence and fate had prepared the robe of sovereignty for the person of the Khān Khānān Ahmad Khān, and no one can object to the ordinances of fate. The Sultān was annoyed at these words, and left the place.

As the rainy season was now over, <sup>2</sup> he marched with a large army towards Arankal (Warangal). When he arrived in that country, he saw a fort built of hard stone, which raised its head to the blue dome of the sky, and round it there was a deep ditch dug, which was thirty dira' (yards) in breadth, and which was connected with (or filled with) water from a spring. His Majesty, the Sultān, remained for two years at the foot of the fort, and was, in spite of that, unable to carry out his object; and on account of the (bad)

---

climate of the place, most of the men and quadrupeds (in his army) were destroyed. When Deo Rāy of Bijānagar became acquainted with what had happened, he took advantage of the opportunity, and sent a large army of cavalry and infantry, and obstructed the entrances and the exits. The Sultān was compelled, therefore, to leave the place for the return journey. Deo Rāy's soldiers attacked the army with arrows and spears. The <sup>1</sup>warriors belonging to the Sultān's army then attacked Deo Rāy's troops, but as the ways were narrow they were unable to accomplish anything. They represented to the Sultān, that at such a crisis, it would be fit and proper for him to hasten away and reach a place of safety; for the safety of the army, they said, was bound up with the safety of the sovereign. The Sultān said, "How can it be allowed in the religion of manliness and humanity, that I should go to a place of safety, and leave my soldiers to perish or to be taken prisoners". At this conjuncture, a person having the form of a demon and the nature of an evil spirit, coming from the enemy's army, <sup>2</sup>inflicted a wound on the Sultān, and fighting bravely, escaped out of the orbit of the Sultān's army. The *amirs*, seizing the Sultān's bridle took him out of the danger, and carried him away to <sup>3</sup>Gulburga.

The Sultān then wrote letters, giving an account of the events,<sup>4</sup> and conched in sincere language, to Sultān Ahmad of Gujrāt; and

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah's account is different, and altogether more probable. He says that Mir Fazl-ul-lah, rallying the soldiers, nearly defeated the Bijānagar army, when *بکی از کفار کهنود* a Hindū of Calnara, who had been a long time in his service, but who had been seduced by the promise of a high dignity by Deo Rāy, killed him by inflicting a serious wound on his head. The Sultān's army was now routed, and the Sultan with the assistance of Ahmad Khān escaped, with the remnant of his army. Firishtah does not mention the Sultān's being wounded by a person with the form of a demon and the nature of an evil spirit.

<sup>2</sup> There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. has *ضربی بر سلطان زد*, the other has *ضربی از سر سلطان زد*, while the lith. ed. has *ضربی سلطان زد*.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah goes on to say that the Hindūs (I am quoting from Col. Briggs) "made a general massacre of the Musalmans" . . . . . "and subsequently took many towns, broke down mosques and other holy places, slaughtered the people without mercy; and by their savage conduct seemed desirous to discharge the vengeance and resentment of many ages".



asked for help from him. But the army of Gijrāt had not yet arrived, when the Sultan fell ill from excessive anger (or mortification); and as his illness increased, none of his adherents wanted that they should seize the Khān Khānān, prince Ahmad Khān, and should draw a pencil across his world-seeing eyes. The Khān Khānān receiving information of this, withdrew himself into the corner of safety. The soldiers, however, came from all sides and joined him. Firūz Shāh went out with one of his slaves with twenty thousand horsemen and some elephants to reach him. After the two armies had met, <sup>1</sup> Firūz Shāh's army fled. The latter, in spite of his illness

<sup>1</sup> According to Fīrīhtah, however, Sultan Ahmad (of Gijrāt) having only recently ascended the throne, and his affairs being still unsettled, the message had no effect; but the king's brother Ahmad Khān, the Khān Khānān, opened the door of the treasury, collected a new army, and drove the Gijrāt army out of the kingdom.

<sup>2</sup> Fīrīhtah says, that when Firūz Shāh's illness was prolonged, the management of affairs fell into the hands of two slaves, named, respectively, Hushiyār 'Alī-ul-mulk and Bīdār Nizām-ul-mulk, and they told the Sultan, that an Ahmad Khān was very powerful and popular, his son Husām Khān could only succeed him, if Ahmad Khān could be removed, and Firūz Shāh also remembered what Saiyyid Muhammad (Ghaff-Darāz) had told him about the succession, and he determined upon depriving Ahmad Khān of his eyesight.

<sup>3</sup> According to Fīrīhtah, the Khān Khānān did not have much to say in success. He first of all went to Saiyyid Muhammad (Ghaff-Darāz), taking his son 'Alī-ul-dīn with him. The Saiyyid took his own turban from his head and divided it into two parts, and bound them on the heads of the father and the son. Col. Briggs says erroneously, that it was 'Alī-ul-dīn's turban that was cut into two portions. After that the Khān left home early the next morning with only four hundred tried soldiers. At the gate he was joined by Khūf Husām of Husrah, who was an old friend of his. He dissuaded him from attacking himself to his hopeless cause, but Khūf Husām refused to leave him; and it was his advice and help that conducted to his success. Fīrīhtah agrees with our author in saying that after the Khān Khānān's first success Firūz Shāh got into a panic, and advanced against the Khān Khānān; but he says that before doing this, he had the umbrella of sovereignty placed over the head of his son Husām Khān. In the second battle, which took place at a distance of three *karās* from Hummābād Gulbarga, Firūz Shāh saluted owing to his great weakness, and the report got about that he had been killed. The soldiers then went over to the Khān Khānān. The latter out of regard for his brother did not pursue him. Firūz Shāh entered the fort, and the Khān Khānān encamped outside. Then Hushiyār 'Alī-ul-mulk and Bīdār Nizām-ul-mulk began to



another statement poison was given to him. The period of his reign was twenty-five years and seven months and twenty days.

#### 1A NARRATIVE OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN AHMAD SHĀH BAHMANI.

When the throne of the empire and the seat of government was adorned by the accession of Ahmad Shāh, all sections of the people were very happy with the perfection of his justice, and his all-comprehending beneficence. He acted with such justice and equity, that the habit of tyranny and the custom of oppression became obsolete among men.

Couplet :

The door of justice was opened so wide,  
That the sparrow of the hawk, a house mate became.

In the scales of his spirit, dust and gems appeared to have the same price. He was in the society of learned and great men at most times; and lavished much wealth on them. In following the law of the Prophet, he never showed himself to be deficient, in any way, as far as it lay in his power. He showed his respect and veneration to the descendants of the Prophet and to the successors of saints and holy men, in a way, that it was impossible to conceive anything in excess of it. <sup>2</sup>In connection with this, they relate this story of him. He had an *amīr* of the name of Shīr Malik, into whose hands he had entrusted the reins of the government. Shīr Malik was returning after capturing a great fort which was famous in

و در بعضی کتب بنظر در امدۀ کہ احمد شاه بوسوسہ و تحریک خواہر زادہ  
خود شیر خان فیروز شاہ را خفہ کردہ بکشت و اللہ عالم بصقیت الحال  
He says *و در بعضی کتب بنظر در امدۀ کہ احمد شاه بوسوسہ و تحریک خواہر زادہ* which may  
be translated as "And it has come to my notice, in some books, that Ahmad Shāh  
had Kīrīz Shāh strangled to death, at the instigation of his sister's son Shīr  
Khān; but God only knows the real truth of the matter.

<sup>1</sup> There are variations in the heading. One MS. has ذکر سلطان احمد شاه; the other leaves out the word سلطان. The reading in the lith. ed. ذکر  
سلطان احمد شاه بن فیروز شاه بہمن is altogether incorrect. Ahmad Shāh was the  
brother, and not the son of Kīrīz Shāh.

<sup>2</sup> This summary and barbarous punishment for insulting a Saiyyad occurred  
very near the end of the Sultān's reign. It is mentioned by Firīhtah as having  
occurred in 837 A.H., and Ahmad Shāh died the next year.

that country, and came to a sea port. On the way a Saiyyad of the name of Nāsir-ul-dīn 'Arab, to whom Sultān Ahmad had entrusted a large sum of money, so that he might go to Karhalā, and open out a stream of water there, met him. Saiyyad Nāsir-ul-dīn did not show such respect to Shīr Malik, as the latter had expected. He merely met him, mounted as he was. Shīr Malik told his servants, and they made Nāsir-ul-dīn dismount from his horse. The Saiyyad returned from that place, and came into the presence of the Sultān, and informed the latter of what had happened. The Sultān comforted him and sent him back. After some days Shīr Malik arrived near (the place where the Sultān was); and high and low hastened to meet him; and brought him to the royal threshold. And at the very instant, when the Sultān's eye fell on him, he ordered that an elephant of the name of 'Qassālī might be brought in to the presence; and at that very moment, without any talk or discussion, Shīr Malik was thrown under the elephant's feet. The Sultān said, "This is the punishment for insulting Saiyyads".

"When the Sultān was established on the throne of State, news came that the army of Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī, which Sultān Firūz had summoned, had arrived at the frontier. Ahmad Shāh sent presents and gifts for Sultān Ahmad; and gave permission to the *amīrs* of Gujrāt to return; and he also sent presents to the *amīrs*, in accordance with their condition and rank.

"As Deo Rāy had been guilty of unmannerly conduct during the reign of Firūz Shāh, Sultān Ahmad Shāh, in retaliation of that,

<sup>1</sup> The name appears to be فاسب Fāsāb in the MSS. and تاسب Tasāb in the lith. ed. It is قصاب Qasāb (butcher according to Col. Briggs) in Firishtah.

<sup>2</sup> I cannot find any mention of this in Firishtah. On the other hand the latter says سلطان احمد شاه ..... خاص و عام را مطیع و منقاد خود ساخت و which means that Sultān Ahmad Shāh . . . . . made high and low submissive to himself, and placed the frontier of Gujrāt in charge of trustworthy *amīrs*, and thus assured his mind on that side.

<sup>3</sup> Instead of the very vague and sketchy account of the campaign which follows, Firishtah has a long and graphic account, which may be summarised thus. The Sultān advanced with forty thousand horsemen to the Tungābhadrā. The Rāy of Bijānagar also advanced to the river, after summoning the Rāy of

advanced towards Bijānagar, on the first *Nauroz* after his accession. After traversing many stages, when he arrived within the territories

---

Warangal to his help. The two armies halted for forty days on opposite banks of the river. Then weary of the delay, the Sultān called a council of war; and finding his officers impatient to cross the river, he despatched some of them with a body of men. They crossed the river at a ford at some distance, and by day-break reached the Rāy's camp. The Rāy of Talingāna had already deserted his ally and marched away. The Rāy of Bijānagar was sleeping in his tent when the vanguard of the Musalmān army arrived, and, being alarmed, fled almost naked into a sugar-cane plantation. Here some Musalmān soldiers found him and taking him to be an ordinary villager, made him carry a bundle of sugar-cane. Then when the Sultān had crossed the river, the soldiers hoping to find more valuable plunder than sugar-cane, left him; and he, with great trouble, about midday came up with some of his officers, who recognised him and received him with great joy. He, however, considered the late accident as a bad omen and fled to Bijānagar. The Sultān without waiting to besiege the Rāy's capital, overran the open country; and put men, women and children to death without mercy; and whenever the number of the slain amounted to twenty thousand, he halted for three days, and held a great festival. He also demolished Hindū temples (Butkhānhā Wa Kanāis, which Col. Briggs translates as "Idolatrous temples and colleges of the brahmins"). Then five thousand Hindūs took an oath to kill the Sultān in revenge for these outrages. They attacked him one day when he was separated from his attendants, while out hunting. He took shelter in a small mud enclosure used as a fold for cattle, and was in great danger, till 'Abd-ul-qādir, his armour bearer, came up with a body of men, and after a severe conflict the Hindūs were defeated. After this the Sultān closely blockaded Bijānagar; and the people being in great distress the Rāy sued for peace; and the Sultān agreed, on condition that the Rāy should send all arrears of tribute, laden on his best elephants, with his son. The Rāy agreed, and sent his son with thirty elephants laden with the treasures. The Rāy's son was received by the Sultān, and was presented with a robe, a sword set with gems, twenty beautiful horses of different countries, a male elephant, some hounds for the chase, and a leash of hawks; and was dismissed from the banks of the Krishnā; and the Sultān returned to Gulbarga.

Mr. Sewell's remarks on the above narrative are, (1) the fact of the Rāy's camp being close to a sugar-cane plantation indicates that it was probably close to one of the old irrigation channels supplied by dams constructed across the river by the Rāys; (2) that it is difficult to reconcile the story with the fact that the Rāy (Deva Rāyā II) was then quite a boy; and that the Musalmān chroniclers, from whom Firishtah obtained the facts, mistook some adult member of the Rāy's family, who commanded the army, for the Rāy; and (3) that it is useless to speculate as to the locality where the Sultān was



benefactions; and spread the shadow of safety and of his kindness on the guests and the residents; and kept open the gates of pleasure and enjoyment, so that men might occupy themselves in various pleasures; and <sup>1</sup>take what was due to them from the cup bearer of time. The Sultān summoned the Qāzis and the learned men, and the men possessing the knowledge of God, and the great men of the city and arranged the marriage assembly; and (afterwards) he sent back the sons and the adherents of Nasir Khān after showing them every honour, and conferring on them many marks of his kindness.

In the year 826 A.H., Sultān Ahmad Shāh collected an immense army; and <sup>2</sup>advanced towards the country of Tilang; but on account of certain matters connected with the kingdom, he returned from the way, and came back to Gulbarga. Then in the year <sup>3</sup>828 A.H., 1424 A.D., he again advanced towards Tilang; and certain

<sup>1</sup> The meaning is not quite clear. The actual words are از ساقی وقت داد خود بستانند, according to the MSS. The lith. ed. has از ساقی داد وقت خود بستانند.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah does not mention this expedition which ended so abruptly. The affairs of state, which Nizām-ud-dīn refers to, but does not describe, were the total failure of rain in 826 and 827 A.H. In 826, no rain fell, streams and wells became dried up, and the ground parched. Sultān Ahmad Shāh opened the doors of his treasury, and supported his troops. He also opened the doors of the public granaries, and fed the poor and the needy. The next year also there was no rain, and the Sultān in great distress called upon the learned and pious men and Shaikhs to pray for rain; but this had no effect, so the people became seditious, and spoke of the reign as unlucky. Then the Sultān in great sorrow went out to the open country, and going on an eminence bowed down in prayer, and placing his head on the ground made lamentations and supplications. About this time clouds gathered together, and rain began to fall. This is the translation of the passage in the lith. ed.; but Col. Briggs says that "the Sultān repaired to the mosque in state to crave heaven's mercy for his subjects". The Persian text goes on to say, that so much rain fell, that the men who had accompanied the Sultān began to shiver, and they acclaimed the Sultān with the title of *Walī* or Saint.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Sewell says that 828 A.H. began only on November 23rd, 1424, but the campaign was very short and may have been finished before the end of December. The account of the expedition as given by Firishtah is different from that given in the text. According to Firishtah the Sultān marched to Golkonda, where he halted for a month and twenty days, and sent Khān Ā'azam 'Abd-ul-

forts, which at the time of the catastrophe (in Īrīz Shāh's reign), had passed out of the Sultān's possession, again came into it. He then took tribute from the Kalāntars or chiefs of Rājkonḍa and Deorkonḍa; and returned to Gulhargā.

In the year 829 A.H., news came that the Rāy of Māhūr had strayed from the path of allegiance, and was bent on war and bloodshed. Sultān Ahmad Shāh collected an army, which was beyond all calculation, and advanced to punish him. The Rāy fortified himself in the fort of Māhūr. The Dakinī army ravaged the neighbourhood of the fort, and rased everything to the ground. In the end the Rāy came forward with humility and repentance, and joined the band of the Sultān's loyal adherents: and whatever had been in his possession came again into the Sultān's possession.

---

Latīf as commander of the vanguard. When he advanced again, news came that the Rāy had arrayed his army for battle, but had been defeated and slain with seven thousand of his cavalry and infantry. The Sultān on reaching Warangal took possession of the city, and all the treasure which the Rāy and his ancestors had collected. He then gave a suitable reward to the Khān A'azam 'Abd-ul-Latīf, and sent him to conquer the other portions of the kingdom; and he returned to the Sultan at Warangal, after conquering the whole country in the course of three or four months. If this account be accepted, then Mr. Sewell's remark that the campaign might have been finished before the end of 1421 cannot be correct.

As to Nizām-ud-dīn's account, I cannot find any mention in the other accounts of this expedition of Rājkonḍa or Deorkonḍa, or their Kalāntars. But it appears from the accounts of the reign of Sultān Humāyūn, grandson of Sultān Ahmad Shāh, as given by both Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishṭah, that the Telugu of Deorkonḍa offered a stout resistance to the generals of Sultān Humāyūn. This is also mentioned by Mr. Sewell in page 98 of his book, where he calls the place Devarkonḍa. And in page 132 of his book, he says that Sultān Quli Quth Shāh of Golkonḍa "took Rāzkonḍa and Devarkonḍa, fortresses respectively S.E. and S.S.E. of Hyderābād in Telingāna". Rāzkonḍa (which is apparently identical with Rājkonḍa) and Devarkonḍa are both shown in the map of South India, opposite to page 76 of Mr. Sewell's book; so there may be some foundation for Nizām-ud-dīn's statement.

<sup>1</sup> Contrary to this, Firishṭah says that after the *Zamīndār* of Māhūr had submitted, the Sultān breaking his engagement with him, had him and five or six thousand Hindūs put to death, and imprisoned their sons and daughters, and forced them to become Musalmāns. Firishṭah also says that at this time the Sultān took possession of the fort of Kalan (Briggs calls it Kullam), and also of



<sup>1</sup>After the conquest of Māhūr, as the kingdom became more extensive, the *amīrs* submitted that one of the Shāhzādas might be declared to be the heir apparent; and *sūbas* might be allotted to the others, so that the rule of sincerity and friendship might continue among the "brothers of purity". The Sultān said, "Please tell me whatever might have been decided in your minds on the subject of the heir apparent". The *amīrs* submitted "Shāhzāda 'Alā-ud-dīn is endowed with high attributes and is most anxious and painstaking in the management of measures for the amelioration of the condition of the *raiyats*, and for improving the condition of the poor and oppressed". The Sultān applauded the opinion of the *amīrs* and appointed Shāhzāda 'Ala-ud-dīn to be the heir apparent and <sup>2</sup>made Muhammad Khān over to him. <sup>3</sup>He conferred the country of Māhūr with its dependencies on Shāhzāda Mahmūd Khān, and he gave the fort of Rājūr (Rāichur) with its surrounding country to Dāūd Khān, and took an engagement from all his sons, that they should never be hostile to one another, and should keep the *raiyats*, and the poor and oppressed, who have been entrusted to them by God, in comfort. He also directed them that they should treat the following <sup>4</sup>four noble classes among men with special respect and

---

a diamond mine, which had up to that time been in the possession of the ruler of Gondwara.

<sup>1</sup> The date of these transactions is not given either by Nizām-ud-dīn or by Firishtah, but it appears that they took place between 829 and 833 A.H.

<sup>2</sup> The meaning of this is not clear; but the following passage from Firishtah, who after saying that the Sultān made 'Alā-ud-dīn his heir says و برادر کوچک او شاهراد محمد خان را که کوچک ترین فرزندان بود شریک شاهی وی گردانید which means, that he made his (i.e., 'Ala-ud-dīn's) youngest brother, Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān who was his youngest son, co-sharer in the kingdom with him (i.e., with 'Alā-ud-dīn).

<sup>3</sup> According to Firishtah the distribution was different. He says Ramgar (Rangir according to Col. Briggs) and Māhūr and Kalan and a small part of Berār were given to Shāhzāda Mahmūd Khān; and Shāhzāda Dāūd Khān was sent, with the insignia of royalty, and some old and trustworthy *amīrs* to assume the government of Tilang.

<sup>4</sup> It may be mentioned that the four noble classes of the community here mentioned somewhat resemble the four sections of the Indian people as originally classified by the Indian *Sāstras* of Brāhmana, Kshatriya, Vaisya, and Sūdra, though of course they were not castes, as they later became in India. Firishtah

esteem; *viz.* first, learned men, for their minds are the fountains of philosophy and Divine knowledge; second, writers, as this great band adorn the cheek of the country, and the face of the state with <sup>1</sup>constructive guidance, by the tongues of their pens.

Couplet:

As the Shāh-in-shāh's sword lays the foundation of the state,

The tongue of the pen, of rules becomes its guide.

The third are the men of arms, for the well-being of the people ('ibad, literally the servants of God), and the putting down of all disturbances in the country, are bound up with (the existence of) this body; and the <sup>2</sup>flashes of the light of their lances, which put down all disturbances are the guardians of religion and of the state; and the tongue of the ruthless swords explain the texts of victory and triumph. The fourth are the cultivators, for the stability of the world, and the continued existence of mankind are bound up with and sustained by the exertions of this body. For if they show any negligence, and permit idleness to find its way into their limbs, the supply of food, which is the means of the maintenance of life and of the sustenance of existence, would be completely cut off. And after giving necessary counsel and directions he sent Mahmūd Khān and Dāūd Khān to the *subas* to which they had been nominated.

Then in the year 830 A.H., he appointed Khalf Hasan 'Arab who had the title of Malik-ut-tujjār to conquer the <sup>3</sup>island of

---

does not say anything about the Sultān's direction and precepts about these classes.

<sup>1</sup> The words the meaning of which is obscure appear to be بحال تعمیر in one MS., and in the lith. ed.; and عیال تعمیر in the other MS.

<sup>2</sup> The words here are also somewhat obscure. The words in one MS. are و لمعان نواسان قنده نشان نگامبان دین و دولت; the other MS. has left out the whole passage from لمعان to دولت. The lith. ed. agrees with the first MS. but substitutes نواسان for نواسان, and نگامبانان for نگامبان. I think that نواسان and نواسان are both incorrect: and the proper reading should be نور سنان and نگامبانان is probably better than نگامبان. I have adopted this reading.

<sup>3</sup> The words which I have translated as the island of Mahāim look like جزیرہ بہایم in one MS. but they are clearly جزیرہ بہایم in the other. In the lith.



<sup>1</sup> In the year 832 A.H., a letter of Narsingh Rāy, who was one of the associates of the line of Ahmad Shāh (*i.e.*, I suppose one of the

<sup>1</sup> See note 3. pp. 49. 50. Firishtah places the war with Sultān Hūshang in 830 A.H., whereas Nizām-ud-dīn says it took place two years later in 832 A.H. To understand the relation between Narsingh Rāy, Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī and Sultān Hūshang of Mandū, it is necessary to go back to the events of 829 about the Rāy of Māhūr as described on p. 47 *ante*, and Firishtah's version referred to in note 1, p. 47. According to Firishtah, after treacherously slaying the *zamīndār* of Māhūr, Ahmad Shāh remained at Elichpūr and erected and repaired fortresses there. He had obtained a grant of Khāndesh, Mālwa and Gujrāt from Taimūr, and his object was to take possession of these territories, and afterwards conquer Bijānagar. Sultān Hūshang, having received information of these ambitious projects, tried to seduce Narsingh Rāy from his allegiance to Sultān Ahmad; but Narsingh Rāy did not agree. Then Sultān Hūshang twice invaded his territory; but was defeated both times. He sent a third army, and the *amīrs* commanding it laid waste Narsingh Rāy's country, and took possession of some *parganas*; and Sultān Hūshang prepared to invade the country in person. After this Narsingh Rāy, in great distress, sent the petition in 832 A.H. to Ahmad Shāh, asking for his help. The latter sent a *farmān* to 'Abd-ul-qādir the Khān Jahān, governor of Berar, to march to the help of Narsingh Rāy; and he also himself advanced with six thousand horsemen to Elichpūr on the pretext of going on a hunting expedition. As Sultān Hūshang was yet in his own territory, he spent two months in hunting. Sultān Hūshang, thinking that the delay was due to Sultān Ahmad's weakness, marched rapidly to Kehrlā, and besieged it. Sultān Ahmad then advanced towards Kehrlā, but at this time some learned men told him, that no Bahmanī Sultān had, up to that time, waged war with a Musalman ruler; and it would bring discredit on him if he, in order to aid a *kāfir*, went to war with Sultān Hūshang. Sultān Ahmad heard this with sorrow, and although he had arrived within twenty *kārs* of Sultān Hūshang's army sent an emissary to the latter, and pointed out to him that Narsingh Rāy was an adherent of his, and that it was desirable that he would return to his own country, as he was himself returning to his own, at the suggestion of men learned in the law of the Prophet; and he commenced to retire even before his emissary had arrived at Sultān Hūshang's camp. The latter became angry on receiving this message; and presuming upon the fact that his army consisted of thirty thousand horsemen, while that of the Deccan did not exceed fifteen thousand, followed in close pursuit of Sultān Ahmad Shāh. The latter now summoned the learned men, and pointed out to them that he had acted upon their suggestion, and had brought this dishonour on himself; but on the following day he was going to fight anybody that might stand in front of him, whoever he might be; and he accordingly arranged his army, placing the two wings under 'Abd-ul-qādir, Khān Jahān and 'Abd-ul-

latter's tributaries) arrived, to the effect that Sultān Hūshang, the ruler of Mandū, had, with violence and in great force, invaded his territory, and was laying it waste. Sultān Ahmad marched by successive stages to that country. He had not, however, yet arrived there when news came that Nursingh Rāy had removed the yoke of allegiance to the Sultān (i.e., Ahmad Shāh), and had submitted to Sultān Hūshang. Sultān Ahmad Shāh, therefore, turned the rein of his attention, and halted at a place three stages behind, as he did not wish to prolong a war with Musalmāns. (Another) account is this, that Sultān Ahmad had besieged the fort of Kelera when the Rāy summoned Sultān Hūshang to his aid, and agreed to pay him three *lāks* of *tankas* daily towards his expenses. Sultān Hūshang arrived near; and Sultān Ahmad, raising the siege, halted at a place three stages further back. Then Sultān Hūshang pursued him along those three stages and raised the dust of disturbance. The next day, when the fire of battle blazed up, and the field of bloodshed became hot and streams of blood began to flow from the opposing armies, Sultān Ahmad came out of ambush, with two thousand five hundred well tried warriors, and fell on the centre of Sultān Hūshang's army; and in accordance with the words that the beginner (or the aggressor) is the oppressor or is to blame, the army of Mandū was routed. The harem of Sultān Hūshang with all its inmates fell into the hands of the army of the Dakin. Sultān Ahmad with great generosity kept his army back from pursuit; and after some days, sent the inmates of Hūshang's harem back to Mandū, after making all arrangements for them, with an escort of five hundred horsemen, and after sharing the plunder, divided the country among the *jāgīrdār amīrs*.

At the time of returning, when they arrived in the city of Bidar, Khān, the grandson of Ism'īl Fāth, respectively, and the centre under Shāhazīda 'Alā-ud-dīn. He placed four hundred elephants in different groups, and himself with three thousand selected horsemen and twelve elephants remained in ambush. Sultān Hūshang arrived with seventeen thousand horsemen; and before he could arrange his troops, the battle began, and Sultān Hūshang was defeated, as mentioned in the text.

<sup>1</sup> This is the battle referred to in the latter part of the last note.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. call it شهر بدر, the city of Badar or Bidar; but Firishtah in the corresponding passage says و سلطان در همان یورش چون

they found the ground verdant, and the fields pleasing to the heart, and the Sultān selected the place for his capital; and at the moment fixed by the astrologers, laid the foundation brick of the citadel in the ground, and divided it among the *amīrs*; and for the palace, made a plan of a grand mansion. After its completion, the poets, who had accompanied him in the journey, composed verses to be used as inscriptions on it. Shaikh Āzurī, who was with him in that expedition, wrote some couplets which were inscribed on the gate.

couplets :

Oh brave! such a palace strong, that for its grandeur great,  
The sky itself is the threshold of its gates sublime,  
The sky could not say, that this transgresses courtesy's  
rule,

'Tis the palace of the world emperor Ahmad Shāh  
Bahman.

The writer of the "Tārīkh Bahmanī, Wal-ahadat-'Alia" says that the Sultān gave Shaikh Āzurī a reward consisting of twelve thousand packages of stuffs.

When the country of the Deccan was purified of the weeds of all enemies, and came into the uncontested possession of Sultān Ahmad,

بحرالی حصار بیدر رسید, from which it appears that the city or fortress of Bīdar is referred to. Firishtah indulges in high praise and loud eulogy of the beauty and salubrity of the place; and recalls the fact that it was the site of the ancient Hindū city of Vidarbha, the scene of the loves of Nala and Damayantī, daughter of Rājā Bhīma Sena of Vidarbha.

<sup>1</sup> There are some variations in the reading of the last line. The MSS. have قصر سلطان جهان احمد بهمن شاه است. The lith. ed. has قصر سلطان جهان احمد شاه است. These couplets are also quoted by Firishtah. According to him the second line is اسمان سده از پای این درگاه است; and the last line is identical with that in the MSS. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. According to Firishtah, the reward paid to Shaikh Āzurī was forty thousand white *tangas*, each of them being one *tola* of silver, besides twenty thousand more paid to him for the expenses of his journey, as he was then about to return to his own country, *Khurāsān*. It appears also that Shaikh Āzurī wrote the *Bahman-nāmā*, a chronicle of the Bahman dynasty in verse, which he continued to write even after his return to *Khurāsān*: and after him Mulla Nazārī and Mulla Sāmā'ī and others continued it.

According to Firishtah, the fort or citadel of Ahamadābād Bidar, which was the name given to the new capital, was finished in 836 A.H., 1432 A.D.

he, in the year 835 A.H., marched to capture the fort of <sup>1</sup>Tanbūl, which is situated on the boundary of Gujrat, and arriving near it by successive marches, surrounded it. When the siege had been prolonged for two years, Sultān Ahmad of Gujrat, at last, with great amity and courtesy sent an emissary with this message: "If this *fiqir* had been present at the (wedding!) festivities of Shāhrāda 'Alā-ud-dīn, he (Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī) would have shown him some courtesy. It is now the prayer of the *fiqir*, that in place of that courtesy, he would leave this fort in the possession of its owner". Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī, turning from the high way of generosity and the path of politeness, began to take the course of having a consultation on the matter. Some of his *ra'īs* said that the right of gift can only be exercised, if the fort comes into his (i.e., the Sultān's) possession; while another body said that the prayer of Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī should be honoured with the courtesy of acceptance. The Sultān preferred the first opinion; and sent a reply, that when the fort should come into his possession, it would be made over to his (Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī's) servants. The latter was enraged on receiving this reply, and sent a large body of troops to reinforce the garrison of the fort; and when this news reached the ear of Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī, he withdrew his forces from the fort:

---

<sup>1</sup> Firishṭah's account is somewhat different. He says that after the defeat of Khālī Hasan in his attack on Māhim, Sultān Ahmad collected a large army, and Sultān Ahmad of Gujrat also did the same, and came forward to meet him. The Derran army at first besieged the fort of *میدول* [which looks like Mabiḍl; Col. Briggs says that "the Derranis in the first instance laid siege to a hill fort, (in a footnote Tembola) in Baglana"], which was in the possession of the adherents of Sultān Ahmad Shāh Gujrātī; but when the latter came to the neighbourhood, he raised the siege and the two armies remained facing each other for a long time, neither party daring to commence the fight, till at last the learned men in the two armies intervened, and peace was concluded, each Sultān being satisfied with his own possessions, and neither was to attempt to seize any part of the other's dominion. Firishṭah refers to the slightly different versions of the affair given in the *Turikh-i-Alā* and other histories.

The Cambridge History of India (see p. 491) calls the fort Bhaul on the Girmā, which was held for Gujrat by Malik Sarādat. In p. 599 in the chapter which contains the history of Gujrat and Khāndesh apparently the same fortress was called Ba'tuol which it was said there was gallantly defended by Malik Sarādat, an officer of Gujrat.

of the fort; and the Gujrāt army also halted some distance behind. The Sultān, having removed the dream of capturing the fort from his head, went to Gulbarga. The writer of the *Kitāb-i-Bahādurī* has narrated these transactions in a different manner. If the great God so wills it, the pen of the writer will describe it in the section about the Sultāns of Gujrāt.

<sup>1</sup> In the year 838 A.H., an illness overtook the person of the Sultān; and with a sound resolution and true intention he repented of all his offences and sins, and gave counsel and direction to his eldest son Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn in the presence of the *amīrs* and *vazīrs*. He then spoke thus to the *amīrs*: "I have this hope from you that you will pray for the absolution of my sins to the great God. I am hoping that as in my time the hand of tyranny was too short to reach the skirts of the oppressed and helpless, so the great and holy

<sup>1</sup> The following incidents which occurred in 836 and 837 A.H. and which are mentioned by Frishtah have not been referred to by Nizām-ud-dīn: (1) the completion of the city of Ahmadābād Bidar in 836 A.H.; and (2) the execution, by order of Sultān Ahmad, of his nephew Shīr Khān, at whose instigation he had caused Firūz Shāh to be strangled to death, and whose continued existence appeared to be likely to be the cause of his son being deprived of the empire. This also was in 836. And in 837 A.H., Hūshang Shāh of Mālwa, seeing the hostility between the Sultāns of the Dakin and of Gujrāt, invaded the territory of Narsingh Rāy, and the latter was slain in battle, and Hūshang Shāh seized the fort of Kehla. Then Sultān Ahmad advanced towards Kehla when Na'ir Khān of A'ir intervened; and peace was concluded on the condition that Kehla should belong to Sultān Hūshang and Berar to Sultān Ahmad. After that Ahmad Shāh marched into Talingūna, and after his return he ordered Shīr Malik to be thrown under the feet of an elephant. This was mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn in the beginning of his account of Sultān Ahmad's reign. Frishtah also gives a rather long account of Sultān Ahmad's veneration for learned and holy people, and of his sending emissaries to Shāh Nī'mat-*ul-lah* of Kirmān, and the latter's sending one of his favourite disciples, Mullā Qutb-ud-dīn, and later on his grandson Mīr Nur-*ul-lah*.

After Shāh Nī'mat-*ul-lah*'s death, his son Shāh Khulī-*ul-lah* came to the Deccan with his family, and his sons Shāh Habib-*ul-lah* and Shāh Muhibb-*ul-lah*. Shāh Habib-*ul-lah* married a daughter of Sultān Ahmad Shāh, and Shāh Muhibb-*ul-lah*, a daughter of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn and they attained to great distinction. One of them was distinguished as a military commander and received the title of Ghāzī, and the town of Bīr and the surrounding country as his *jāgīr*.







Sultān sent Khālf Hasan Malik-ut-tujjār to oppose Nasir Khān. After the parties had met, Nasir Khān fled, and went back to Asir. Malik-ut-tujjār pursued him as far as Asir, and after raiding and laying waste the part of that territory returned; and in the same year Nasir Khān became the subject of the inevitable (*i.e.*, died); and according to another statement, this happened in the year 840 A.H.

As at the time of dividing his kingdom among the princes, Ahmad Shāh had placed Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān in charge of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, the latter wanted to give him a proper training and to raise him to the higher grades of leadership and greatness; and in order to carry out this intention, <sup>1</sup> he sent him with an army

Khālf Hasan levied large quantities of gold and gems from the citizens of Burhānpūr; and then devastated the country around, and returning to Burhānpūr burnt down the palace and dug up its foundations, and then gave out that he was marching back to the Deccan; but instead of doing so, he marched rapidly during the night, and appeared before Laling with four thousand horsemen. Nasir Khān, thinking that Khālf Hasan's soldiers must be quite exhausted, met him with twelve thousand horsemen and a large body of infantry, but he was completely routed, and many of his chief men and the rebel *amirs* of Berār were slain. Khālf Hasan then returned to Ahmadābād Bidar, and he was received with great honour and distinction.

I have said in the beginning of this note, that the campaign against Nasir Khān, which is mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn as having occurred in 839, is not mentioned by Firishtah; but on further consideration, I think that the two campaigns, namely that mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn and that described by Firishtah as having occurred in 841, both refer to the same series of events. Khālf Hasan commanded the Deccan army in both, and he is said, in both, to have pursued Nasir Khān to Burhānpūr and to have laid that place waste.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah's account is somewhat different. He says that Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān was sent with 'Imād-ul-mulk Qhūrī, who was made *Amir-ul-umra*, and Khawāja Jahān against Bijānagar, as the Rāy had not sent five years' tribute. They marched into Canāra, and began to plunder and ravage the country. The Rāy in great distress sent the tribute with valuable presents. When they arrived in the neighbourhood of the fort of Mudkal, some discontented officers told Mubammad Khān that the Sultān should either place him by his own side on the *masnad*, and allow him to act with himself in the management of affairs, or should give him half the kingdom. The Shāhzāda was deceived by these words; and he tried to induce 'Imād-ul-mulk and Khawāja Jahān to join him. They refused to do so, whereupon they were

to conquer Bijānagar. <sup>1</sup>Malik 'Imād-ud-dīn Ghūrī, who was in those parts from before the time when the Shāhzāda was sent, when he heard that the Shāhzāda had arrived at the bank of the river Krishnā, joined his army without any hesitation. As the Shāhzāda was not satisfied with the fact that the kingdom should belong to the Sultān, and was waiting for an opportunity, he put Malik 'Imād-ud-dīn, who was perfectly innocent, to death, and raised the standard of revolt and hostility. The Sultān, on receiving information of these occurrences, advanced to punish Muhammad Khān. When the armies met, victory and triumph blew on the plumes of 'Alā-ud-dīn's standards. Muhammad Khān frightened and depressed fled with shame and disgrace.

Complet :

'Gainst thy benefactor, if thou dost transgress,  
If thou art high as the sky, low thy head will fall.

The Sultān kept his troops back from pursnit, on account of the relation of kindness, and halted where he was. At this time an

both put to death. The rebels then collected an army with the help of the tribute obtained from Bijānagar; and took possession of Mudkal, Rāichore, Sholāpūr and Naldrug. Col. Briggs also mentions Bijāpur, but I cannot find it in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Mr. Sewell also mentions Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān's rebellion (see page 71 of his book). He says that the prince took Mudkal, Rāichur, Sholāpūr and Bijāpur and Naldirak from the Sultān's governors. The Sultān was in great grief for the murder of 'Imād-ul-mulk, who, he said, was like a father to him. He then advanced against Muhammad Khān. In the battle which followed the Sultān was victorious, and most of the men who had incited Muhammad Khān were taken prisoners, while Muhammad Khān himself fled to the hills and jungles. 'Alā-ud-dīn returned to Ahmadābād Bidar. He pardoned the rebel leaders, and wrote admonitory letters to his brother, and induced him to come back to him, and, after showing him much kindness, conferred on him the fort of Rāichur and the neighbouring country in Tilang, which had been previously given to prince Dāūd, who was now dead, and sent him there.

<sup>1</sup> The wording of the sentence in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. appears to me to be somewhat illogical. It is قبل از فرستادن ملک عماد الدین غوری که دران سرحد بود چون شنید. The proper form of the sentence would be ملک عماد الدین غوری که قبل از فرستادن شاه زاده دران سرحد بود چون شنید که وی بکنار اب کس رسید; and I have changed the sentence and translated accordingly.

uncle of the Sultān, who had been in the army of Muhammad Khān, was brought before him. The Sultān pardoned his offence, and granted favours to him. When he was again firmly seated on the *masnad* of government, he sent a *farmān* containing much good advice to Muhammad Khān to the following effect: that God the ruler of the world and all who are in it chooses whomsoever He likes among the created beings; and as the rule of eternal grace draws the line of distinction on the page of the condition of that chosen one. He entrusts the keys of success and greatness in the world into the grasp of his power. The tree of grandeur which is watered by the stream of Divine favour never receives any injury from the whirlwinds of calamity; and the sublime mansion which is raised by eternal grace is not endangered by the engines of deceit and treachery.

Couplet:

One who is made great by Him, the sky cannot make him small;

One who is made dear by Him, the world never can wreck.

The result of these comforting arguments is, that one should be satisfied with the justice and grace of God and should not be proud of his own greatness and strength; for the standards of the greatness of such men are always beaten and cast down. It is right and proper that, that fortunate brother should not place his foot outside the path of obedience, and the highway of submission: and should not dispute the will of the great and one holy God, and should not break any engagement and agreement, for such things are evil. And specially after having obtained forgiveness from those who are his elders, he should make his excuses for what has happened, and should not let the dust of distress reach his heart; for the screen of pardon has covered them up. I am conferring <sup>1</sup> *Mauzah Rājūr* in the territory of Tilang on him. He should go there without any delay, and should draw the goods and chattels of life into that corner of safety: and should no longer run after absurd things. When this *farmān* reached Muhammad Khān, he trod on the path of

---

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have مَوْضِع رَانِجَل, Mauza' Ranjal, but I have changed it to Rājūr.

obedience and submission; and went to Rājūr; and the Sultān returned to the capital.

In the year <sup>1</sup> 849 A.H., Khālf Hasan 'Arab, who bore the title of Malik-ut-tujjār, advanced to capture the fort of <sup>2</sup> Sangesar which is one of the largest fortresses on the sea coast. The people of the country, relying on the strength of the jungle fastnesses and the difficult paths, came forward to give battle. The Malik-ut-tujjār, on entering that country, first of all seized the fort of a Rāja who had the name of <sup>3</sup> Sarka by the strength of his brave and heroic arms, and making Sarka prisoner, gave him the choice between death and

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have در سنه تسع و اربعين و ثمانمائة, i.e., 849 A.H., but this is clearly incorrect. Firishtah has سنه اربعين و ثمانمائة, 840 A.H.; and as the war with Nasir Khān, which arose out of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn's love for Zibā Chehra or Peri Chehra, who was brought by Dilāwar Khān as part of the booty obtained in this expedition, and his coldness to his queen Āghā Zainab or Malka-i-Jahān, took place in 841 A.H., the date mentioned by Firishtah, namely 840 A.H., is clearly correct. The accounts of the expedition against the Rāys of Kokan (Concan) as given by Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah are altogether different. First, there is the difference in the date. Then Nizām-ud-dīn says it was led by Khālf Hasan, while according to Firishtah the leader was Dilāwar Khān. It appears however from Firishtah that Khālf Hasan or Malik-ut-tujjār was the leader of another expedition into the Concan in 858 A.H. 1453 A.D., when he was waylaid and slain in circumstances somewhat similar to those mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn. It would appear that the latter has mixed up the two expeditions.

<sup>2</sup> The name is سنگسر Sakar in one MS. شنکر, Shankar in the other and سنگیسر Sangesar in the lith. ed. Firishtah, lith. ed., has سنگیسر Sangesar, but Col. Briggs has Sonkehar; and he says the situation of the place has not been ascertained. There is a place called Sangameswar in the map attached to Elphinston's history, not far from the coast, about half way between Jinjera and Gheria, which may be the place. There is not much difference between the names in the map and in the lith. eds. of the *Ṭabaqāt* and of Firishtah. The latter only requires a م to be inserted.

<sup>3</sup> Col. Briggs says in a note in page 437 of Vol. II of his translation of Firishtah that "Sirka or more properly Sirky (the Sirkey of the excellent *Marratta History*) is the name of one of the most ancient families of the Konkan. The mother of the present Rāja of Satāra was of that house." I have consulted Grant Duff's *History of the Marhattas*. Sirkay is mentioned in the index with 129 against it; but I have not been able to find it in that page or elsewhere.

the acceptance of Islām. That deceitful man told him, <sup>1</sup>“You will gain nothing by slaying me, but the difficulties of the road and the great extent of the jungle are known to everybody. If you allow me to live, I shall lead the army, by a road in which not a single thorn will reach the skirts of any horseman.” The Malik-ut-tujjār trusting his words made him the pioneer of the army and its guide, and commenced to traverse that country. Although the leaders of the army told him, that it was not proper to place any reliance on the words of an enemy, he did not pay any attention to their words; and the misleading guide took them along a road the sight of which, would have frightened even a demon. They were at last brought to a place on three sides of which there were hills and jungles, and on the fourth side, a deep ravine of water which flowed into the jungle; and at this place Sarka gave intimation to the enemy: and that midnight about forty thousand foot soldiers fell on them; and Khalf Hasan with a body of Musalmāns became martyrs; and the remnant of the army, with great trouble and privation returned to <sup>2</sup>Jālma, which was Khalf Hasan’s place of residence.

---

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishtah, Sarka offered to guide the Malik-ut-tujjār against Rāy Sangesar, who was in the neighbourhood of fort Gandhāna, and who was his rival. He also said that after defeating him the Malik-ut-tujjār might make over his territory to Sarka, or to one of the Musalmān *amīrs*. Then he (Sarka) would at once accept *Islām*, and be a loyal tributary of the Sultān. The Malik-ut-tujjār trusting him commenced the journey in 850 A.H., when most of the Dakini and Abyssinian *amīrs* deserted him. Sarka took him along a broad and easy road for two days and everybody was highly pleased with him. but on the third day he led him along a path which, to quote Firishtah’s language, “was so terrible that for fear of it a tiger would become a tigress”, (which apparently, according to Firishtah, is a very timid creature) “and which was more tortuous than the ringlets of fair ones, and thinner than the sighs of lovers”. The Malik-ut-tujjār became ill at this time of a bloody flux: and consequently there was very little order in the army; and at nightfall the soldiers lay down where they could. Sarka disappeared, and Sangesar on receiving a message from him came with thirty thousand armed soldiers, and Sarka joined him with his own men: and they slew seven thousand or eight thousand soldiers like so many sheep: and then fell on Khalf Hasan and his five hundred Bani Hasan ‘Arabs and slaughtered them also.

Col. Briggs calls Rāy Sangesar of Gandhāna, Sankar Rāy of Kehlma.

<sup>2</sup> Called جاکتا *Jākta* in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, where it is described







deceitful men sent Rāja Rustam, who had the title of Nizām-ul-mulk and Sālār Hanra who bore the title of Mashūr-ul-mulk with a blood-thirsty army <sup>1</sup> towards (or to seize ?, *ba-qasd*) Jālna. When Nizām-ul-mulk and Mashūr-ul-mulk arrived in the vicinity of Jālna, they gave assurances of safety to twelve hundred Saiyyads of true and pure descent, and a thousand other foreigners; and made them expectant and hopeful by strong and well-confirmed oaths; and gave them valuable robes of honour, and sent them to their places of residence. On the following day, they arranged a great entertainment and concealed three thousand men inside the house after putting ornaments on their dresses, and invited the Saiyyads to the feast, and showing them all honour and respect made them sit down. They took thirty of them outside on the pretext of giving them their food, and poured the *starbat* of martyrdom into the gullet of each one of them. So that twelve hundred Saiyyads, who were distinguished by the purity of their descent were sent to the grade of martyrdom. In no time whatever, since the time of <sup>2</sup>Yezid the impious and the accursed, had such a calamity occurred.

Complet:

Iron and steel from the same mine come out ;  
But the one a mirror becomes, and the other  
a donkey's shoe.

He also appointed Qasim Beg in place of Khalf Hasan, and made him the commander of the army of Daulatābād and Jūnir. The other leaders of the Mughals were also rewarded, and fresh Mughal levies were ordered to be raised. Mashūr-ul-mulk and Nizām-ul-mulk and all their confederates were punished. They were ordered to be brought from Jālna to Ahmadābād Badar on foot with chains and fetters on them. The houses and property of Mashūr-ul-mulk and Nizām-ul-mulk were appropriated to the Sultan's use; so that their children wandered about homeless and starving. Besides this, Mashūr-ul-mulk and Nizām-ul-mulk were afflicted with leprosy in the course of the year.

<sup>1</sup> There is a slight difference in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have بقصد جالنا as I have in the text. But the other MS. has بقصبة حالند, i.e., to the town of Jālna.

<sup>2</sup> The Caliph Yezid who made the attack on Husain at Karbalā. There are some differences in the readings. One MS. substitutes عصري for عهدي, which is in the other MSS. and in the lith. ed. The lith. ed. has مطرود after ملعون, but this is omitted in both MSS., and both MSS. substitute ابن نوع مصيبت for ابن نوع واقعه.

<sup>1</sup>In their old age, both *Mas'ûr-ul-mulk* and *Nizâm-ul-mulk* became afflicted with leprosy, so that (it may be imagined what would happen to them) in the after life. Oh! holy God, such a father that he cast his own name under the foot of an elephant for insulting one *Saifrad*; and such a son that he caused the massacre of twelve hundred *Saifrads* without any reason whatever.

<sup>2</sup>As the *Râys* of *Konkan* (*Orissa*) taunted of their independence, and did not make their submission, the *Sultân* nominated *Dilâwar Khân* to conquer that country, after conferring on him a special robe of honour: and sent *formânas* to the *amîrs* on the frontier that they should collect their men and should join *Dilâwar Khân*. When the latter arrived at the town of <sup>3</sup>*Kankûla*, <sup>4</sup>he sent *Assd Khân* and

<sup>1</sup> Contrary to this *Finishtah* says *و بروایت غلبات محمود شامی شیر الملک دکن و نظام الملک خوری در همان سال بعلت بوس گرفتن گشتند*.

<sup>2</sup> It appears to me that *Nizâm-ud-dîn* describes here events, which, according to *Finishtah*, happened before the invasion by and defeat of *Nasr Khân*, and the invasion of the *Konkan* by *Khali Hassan*, and the latter's death. (See the early part of note 1, p. 61.) It may be mentioned here that *Nizâm-ud-dîn*'s account differs from *Finishtah*'s in three main particulars: (1) As already mentioned *Nizâm-ud-dîn* places the expedition at a date long posterior to that of *Finishtah*. *Finishtah* says that *Dilâwar Khân* started on the expedition on the *Nasr* (*Maharâm* 1st) of 840 A.H. *Nizâm-ud-dîn* gives no date, but he mentions it after the death of *Khali Hassan* and connected events, which took place according to *Finishtah* in 858 A.H. though *Nizâm-ud-dîn* unfortunately does not give any date: (2) *Finishtah* says that *Dilâwar Khân* sent the daughter of the *Râja* of *Sangesar* or *Sonkehr*, who received the name of *Libâ Chahra*, and became the cause of *Nasr Khân*'s invasion of *Barân*, and his subsequent defeat. *Nizâm-ud-dîn* says that *Dilâwar Khân* sent the daughters of two *Râys*, viz., those of *Sangesar* and *Râhal*, but he does not say anything about what happened to them after they arrived in the *Sultân*'s camp: and (3) *Nizâm-ud-dîn* says vaguely that the *Sultân* turned against *Dilâwar Khân* at the instigation of envious people: but *Finishtah* says, that the *Sultân* learnt that *Dilâwar Khân* had received bribes from the *Râjas* of *Konkan*, and had not done his best to reduce their fortresses. *Finishtah* also says that after *Dilâwar Khân* had retired, the eunuch *Dastûr-ul-mulk* was placed in charge of affairs.

<sup>3</sup> *Kankûla* does not appear to be mentioned by *Finishtah*. He only mentions according to the lith. ed. the *Râys* of *Râhal* and *Sangesar*. Col. Briggs calls them the *Râys* of *Sonkehr* and *Rairee*. As to *Sangesar* or *Sonkehr* see p. 61, note 2.

<sup>4</sup> There are differences in the reading. One MS. has *را نشیب کر فرستاد تا* the other has *را فرستاد تا ولایت* و *خراب کردند* the lith. ed. agrees with the reading of the first MS.

Fīlād Khān and Safdar Khān; and they devastated the country, and burnt down houses and other structures. The Rāy of Sangesar, who was the chief of the country, owing to great weakness and exhaustion sent an emissary to Dilāwar Khān and promised to send a large tribute with his daughter; and also engaged that henceforward they would not place their feet outside the path of obedience. Dilāwar Khān agreed to his prayer, and sent the Rāy's daughter, and the heavy tribute to the capital; and himself advanced to capture the fort of <sup>1</sup> Rāhal which was one of the most important forts of that country. On arrival at that neighbourhood Safdar Khān and Fīlād Khān and a <sup>2</sup> body of men commenced to plunder the wealth of the country, and to destroy it. The inhabitants availing themselves of a fit opportunity made a sudden attack and in that action the brother and the son of Dilāwar Khān became martyrs. Dilāwar Khān with the help of the great and holy God collected his soldiers and dispersed the assailants; and made many men food for the blood-drinking swords. After repeated battles and much bloodshed, the Rāy of that district spread the bed of excuses; and sent his own daughter with a large quantity of tribute to Dilāwar Khān. The latter pardoned his offences; and returned to the presence of the Sultān; and was distinguished by kindnesses and favours. When the greatness and power of Dilāwar Khān reached their zenith, the disposition of the Sultān turned against him at the instigation of envious people; and so he withdrew his hand from the Sultān's service, and retired into a corner of safety.

As the Rāy of Bijānagar got information of this delicate state of affairs, and knew that the Sultān would not march in person, he in the <sup>3</sup> year 847 A.H. plundered certain *parganas* on the frontier and

<sup>1</sup> The name looks like *وايل*, or *دايل* in the MSS. It is *رايل* in the lith. ed., Firishtah lith. ed. also has *راعل*; and I have accordingly retained *راعل*. Col. Briggs has Raireo.

<sup>2</sup> There are differences of readings here also. One MS. has *مفدر خانرا و فولاد* the other MS. has *مفدر خان و فولاد خان و جمع* که در نهب اموال و غارت ازواج شروع کردند the lith. ed. has *مفدر خان و فولاد خان و جمعی* که در نهب اموال و غارت ازواج شروع کردند The readings of the 2nd MS. and the lith. ed. appear to me to be nearly correct, but the word *که* should be omitted, and a *و* inserted before *جمعی* in the lith. ed.

<sup>3</sup> This campaign is mentioned both by Firishtah and by Mr. Sewell. The date given by Nizām-ud-dīn, 847 A.H., (1443 A.D.) is correct; but the campaign

carried away cattle and other goods and chattles. The Sultān, having received information of this unfortunate occurrence, advanced

---

took place, while the Malik-ut-tujjār was yet alive, and he took part in it as will be seen later on, so that although the date is correct, the chronological order of Nizām-ud-dīn's account is incorrect. Firishtah commences his account by saying that the Rāy of Bijānagar convened a council of chiefs and Brahmans, to consider how it was, that in spite of the fact that his country, the Carnātic, was larger in extent, and had more population and revenue than the Bahmani kingdom, the ruler of the latter was always victorious in all campaigns. The Brahmans, like the Brahmans of Lakshman Sen's court at once quoted their Sāstras and said that according to these, they were to be subject to the Musalmāns for thirty thousand years. Others said that the Musalmāns had stronger horses and better archers; and the Rāy ordered that Musalmāns should be enlisted in his service, and *jāgirs* should be granted to them, and a mosque should be erected in Bijānagar for their use; and no one should interfere with them in the exercise of their religion; and a copy of the *Qurān* should be placed in front of his throne, so that the Musalmāns might salute it. He also ordered his soldiers to be trained in archery, so that he soon had ten thousand Musalmāns and sixty thousand *kāfir* horsemen, who all had knowledge of archery, and three lakhs of infantry. He then crossed the Tungābhadrā, and conquered the fort of Mudkal and sent his sons to besiege Rājore and Bankāpūr; and stationed himself on the bank of the Krishnā; and his soldiers raided as far as Saghir and Bijāpūr. Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn ordered his forces to assemble, and when fifty thousand cavalry and sixty thousand infantry were ready, the Sultān at an auspicious moment marched out with artillery and other munitions of war. Deo Rāy advanced to the fort of Mudkal. The Sultān sent Khalf Hasan Basri, Malik-ut-tujjār, with the army of Daulatābād against the sons of Deo Rāy; and Khān Zamān with the army of Bijāpūr and Khān A'azam with that of Borār against Deo Rāy himself. Khalf Hasan advanced to Rājore and fought with the elder son of Deo Rāy, so that he was wounded and had to flee. He then advanced towards Bankāpūr, and he had not yet reached that place, when the younger son of the Rāy fled and joined his father. Then there was a great battle near Mudkal, and both sides suffered heavy losses, the Musalmāns suffering more than the Hindūs. Then a second battle was fought, and the Musalmāns were victorious; and the elder son of the Rāy, who had fled from Mudkal was killed by a spear thrown at him by Khān Zamān. The Hindūs fled panic-struck into the fort of Mudkal; and Fakhr-ul-mulk Dehlavi and his brother pursuing them closely, entered the fort, were captured, and were taken before Deo Rāy. The Sultān then sent a message to the Rāy, that if these two men were killed, he would slay two lakhs of Hindūs to avenge their deaths. Deo Rāy then sent a message to the Sultān that if he would in future refrain from attacking his country; he would send an annual tribute, and return

towards the country of Bijānagar. He distributed large quantities of arms and many horses (among his soldiers); and advancing rapidly besieged the fort of Mudkal. As all appliances for the capture of the fort were prepared, and the garrison saw death before their eyes, the Rāy of Bijānagar, on account of great misery and wretchedness, sent an emissary and prayed for the pardon of his offences; and entered into an agreement, that he should send tribute every year, and <sup>1</sup>he should at once pay in cash whatever the Sultān should have expended on this expedition. The Sultān then drew the pen of forgiveness across his offences; and returned to his capital; and he (*i.e.*, the Rāy) paid whatever he had agreed to pay, and thus gained safety. The Sultān arranged a great entertainment, in the vicinity of the capital, and conferred distinctions on the *amīrs*, bestowing on them robes of honour and other favours. He then stayed for some time at the seat of the empire.

<sup>2</sup> As Sikandar Khān Bukhārī had a great share in the rebellion of Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān; and although after that Sultān

the two prisoners uninjured, and never transgress the rules of obedience. The Sultān agreed to these proposals. Deo Rāy sent the two *amīrs* and the arrears of tribute of some years, and valuable presents: and the Sultān also sent presents, and then returned to his capital.

This account abridged from Firishtah contains more facts than the vague narrative in the *Ṭabaqāt*. Col. Briggs calls Fakhr-ul-mulk Mashir-ul-mulk. Mr. Sewell also mentions the incident, but he does not give their names, but calls them two chief Muhammadan officers (page 76). He also says that the campaign must have been of short duration, since while it began in 847 A.H. (May 1st, 1443 A.D. to April 19th, 1444 A.D.), according to Firishtah, it was over before December, 1443, when "Abdur Razzāk (who came as ambassador from Persia to Calicut and Vijayanagar) left Vijayanagar". (Page 77.)

<sup>1</sup> The words which I have translated "would pay in cash" are in the MSS. *نقد جواب گوید* and *جواب گوید* and in the lith. ed. *بنقد جواب گوید* the meaning of which I am told is "to pay cash on the spot".

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah's account of the rebellion of Sikandar Khān Bukhārī is as follows. In 857 A.H., the Sultān had an ulcer in his leg, which his physicians could not cure; and he therefore came very rarely out of the palace, and the report of his death was spread about. Upon this Jalāl Khān Bukhārī, son-in-law of Sultān Ahmad Shāhī, who had *jāgīrs* in *sarkār* Nalkonda in Tilang, believing that the Sultān was dead, took possession of a large tract of country in his neighbourhood and wanted to make his son Sikandar Khān ruler of that

'Alā-ud-dīn had, after his victory, pardoned his offences he was always afraid and had suspicions of the Sultān's anger; and could not be assured in the matter of the latter's favourable disposition towards him. At last some evil-disposed persons informed him in the months of the year 960 A.H., of some words which they told him had been uttered by the Sultān. Sikandar Khān now, having no other alternative, resolved upon acting ungratefully; and sent a message to Sultān Mahmūd Khālji, ruler of Malwā, and persuaded him to attempt the conquest of the country of Berār. Sultān Mahmūd then advanced to Berār from Mandū: and Sikandar Khān advanced with one thousand

troop of country. The Khān A'azam had also at that time died, and there was no one of high rank in Tilang; and the omīr of that province wanted to make Sikandar Khān the Sultān there. Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, in spite of his illness began to collect troops to march against him. Upon that Jalāl Khān held a council and decided that he should hold that country, while Sikandar Khān should march to Māhur, and take possession of it, so that the attention of the Sultān should be distracted between the two rebellions. The Sultān sent a *gauh-nāma* (or agreement) to Sikandar Khān: but as he had had a large share in the rebellion of Shāhrazda Muhammed Khān, and had committed the present acts of hostility, he could not in any way be assured of his safety, and so he sent a message to Sultān Mahmūd Shāh Khālji of Malwa, to the effect that Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn had become ill and was dead, but his route had for their own purposes kept the matter in concealment: and that if he would now march in that direction, Berār and Tilang would without any dispute come into his possession. Sultān Mahmūd Khālji after consulting the ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr started in 960 A.H. on his march to Berār. Sikandar Khān advanced for a few stages and met him with a thousand horsemen. Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn cancelled his expedition to Tilang, and sent Khwājs Mahmūd Gūfāi known as Gāwān against Jalāl Khān. He also sent the army of Berār to meet the ruler of Burhānpūr, who had advanced to support Sultān Mahmūd: and sent Qāsim Beg Saf-Shikan with the army of Daulatabād to meet Sultān Mahmūd: and himself, seated in a palanquin, followed at a distance of five *kosās*. Sultān Mahmūd finding that Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn was alive, and was advancing to meet him returned to his own country. He left an officer under the pretence of assisting Sikandar Khān, but with secret instructions to seize him with his treasures, and to bring him to Mandū, if he attempted to escape. Sikandar Khān however received information of this, and joined his father at Nālkonda, which Khwājs Gāwān was then besieging. Then both father and son obtained assurance of safety from the Sultān through the Khwājs: and surrendered the fort to the latter. They then came to the Sultān, and again obtained Nālkonda as their *jāgīr*.

horsemen, for a few stages, and joined him. <sup>1</sup>They then besieged Māhūr, and when a long time passed, and the siege was protracted, Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn came with a large army, to help the garrison, and when he arrived in the vicinity of Māhūr, Sultān Mahmūd marched away at night, and retired towards Mandū. Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn honoured the *thāmadār* of Māhūr with the title of Fakhr-ul-mulk, and conferred many favours on him, and confirmed him in the government of Māhūr, and its dependencies, in accordance with previous custom. He made arrangements for the government of that part of his kingdom; and then returned towards the capital. On the way Sikandar came before him with his head hanging down in shame, and with a shroud tied to his shoulder. The Sultān on account of the great benevolence, which was ingrained in his nature, covered his offences with the skirt of pardon, and exalted him with a special robe of honour.

<sup>2</sup>They say, that Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn was extremely patient and forbearing; and he read the public prayer himself; and praised

<sup>1</sup> This and some of the facts mentioned later have no place in Firishtah's account given in the preceding note.

<sup>2</sup> These incidents are mentioned by Firishtah also in his appreciation of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn's character and attainments. He says "People say that Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn was fluent and eloquent, and knew Persian well; and he had also acquired some knowledge of the sciences. Sometimes on Fridays and the two *'Id's*, he went to the *Juma' masjid*, and ascending the pulpit he read the public prayers, and he praised himself with these titles;" (the titles agree with those in the text, but the name instead of being *أحمد شاه بن الولي ابن* *أحمد شاه بهمني* is *علاء الدين بن عظم السلاطين أحمد شاه ولي بهمني*). Firishtah goes on to say, that one day an 'Arab merchant, who had sold horses for the king's use, the payment for which had been delayed by the officers of the household, being present at the foot of the pulpit, when the Sultān spoke these words, immediately stood up, and said, "By God, thou art neither just nor merciful nor patient nor liberal, but art a tyrant, and a liar, who has slaughtered the Prophet's true and holy descendants, and yet darest to speak these words on the pulpits of the Muslimāns". The Sultān, being much affected wept aloud, and immediately paid the price of the horses; and said "those who have reviled me in this world and the next as being like Yezīd will never escape the fire of the wrath of God. He then went to the palace, and never came out of it, till his coffin was borne out. The fact of the Sultān's owing money to the 'Arab, and ordering its immediate payment, introduces an element of bathos.



himself with the following title; *viz.*, the just, the forbearing, the merciful, the benevolent Sultān over the worshippers of God, the great 'Alā-ud-duniyā-wad-dīn Ahmad Shāh, son of Ahmad Shāh the Wali, son of Muhammad Shāh, Al-Bahmanī. Saiyyad Ajal, to whose great ancestors the position of the honourable *naqīb* of holy *Mashhad* had been entrusted, and who was much grieved at the slaughter of the Saiyyads at Jālma, rose on a day on which Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn recited these titles, in praise of himself, and said, "by God thou art a great liar, thou art not just, nor forbearing nor merciful but hast slaughtered the holy and pure descendants of the Prophet and thou darost to speak these words on the pulpits of the Moslems". Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn came out of the *masjid*; and made no protest of any kind. This story is a clear proof of his forbearance.

<sup>1</sup> In the year 862 A.H., in accordance with the Divine decree, a severe illness fell on the person of the Sultān. When he became hopeless of surviving, <sup>2</sup> he sent one day for Humāyūn Khān who was the most highly cultured and the eldest of his sons, and said, "Oh pupil of my eye! the time has come when I should, with an open brow, accept the summons of death; but there are some royal pearls which I have received as an inheritance from my great ancestors; and which I have treasured and kept concealed in the oyster-shell of my breast; and their beauty and elegance are such, that wisdom the appraiser of gems, who is possessed of perfection of intelligence, has to confess its ignorance in the matter of their price; and the speech of the word-stringing pen, in spite of its fluency and eloquence, has to acknowledge its impotence in describing their advantages and

---

into what would otherwise have been a scene of stern rebuke. This is absent from the version of the incident as told by Nizām-ud-dīn.

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishtah, Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn had an ulcer on his leg in 857 A.H., and it was of such a serious kind that reports of his death were circulated; and the rebellion of Sikandar Khān took place; and although the Sultān was able to proceed against Sultān Mahmūd of Mālwa, he had to do so seated in a *palkī*. The malady appears to have gone on, and brought on the Sultān's death in 862 A.H.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah does not say anything about 'Alā-ud-dīn's precepts and advice to Humāyūn Khān. The latter received the title of *Zālim* or the tyrant, so Nizām-ud-dīn's description of him as *دشمن*,<sup>1</sup> among 'Alā-ud-dīn's sons, does not appear to me to be appropriate.



not also, for a few words or for a suspicion, which may enter your mind, throw an innocent man into the narrow places of danger and the ravine of fear.

You should also in matters of great and small difficulties consult men of intelligence and wisdom; and in the solution of intricate matters and the discovery of difficult things recognise them as just judges and impartial *Qāzīs*; for wise men have said: He who consults, will never repent, as two opinions are (always) better than one; and also you should always consider justice and equity to be the two wings of greatness, and the two arms of the empire. In all matters you should not miss the path of justice and the high way of equity. You should also try to draw the hearts of your subjects and *raiyyats*. In demanding revenue from the *raiyyats*, you should not be harsh; and should not cause pain to the retainers and soldiers by unreasonable demands. You should make every endeavour for the amelioration of the condition of *darvīshes*, and for keeping their hearts in peace and comfort. You should (in fact) so act that when the elemental body, and the limbs, which constitute it, come to extinction; and the physical form and the bodily arrangements pass away, the pages of the volumes of time remain full of descriptions of your good deeds, and praises of your acts.

Couplet:

He who after death leaves a name behind,  
Be sure that in life he did great deeds.

Further you should beware (of causing) the lamentations of the oppressed, who have suffered at the hands of tyrants, and of the injured who have suffered privation and hardship; and you should know for a certainty that the<sup>1</sup> real favour of the great and holy God always watches over the condition of the oppressed ones".

When the *amīrs* and *vazīrs* received information of these directions,<sup>2</sup> Malik Nizām-ul-mulk, who was entrusted with the administra-

<sup>1</sup> The meaning of the words عین عنایت which in one MS. are written as عین عنایت is not clear in the context.

<sup>2</sup> This is also mentioned by Firishtah, who explains the matter somewhat better than Nizām-ud-dīn. He says, that as contrary to their representation, Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn made Humāyūn Shāh Zalim (tyrant), whose manners were hateful to the people, his heir, Nizām-ul-mulk Daulatābādī, who had just

tion of the kingdom, fled and went to his son, who had the title of Malik-ut-tujjār and was the governor of Junnir and from there both of them went away together to Gujrāt. When on the 121st of Jamādī-ul-āwwal, 862 A.H., Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn took his place from the throne (*takht*) on the plank (*takhta*) of the coffin, 2 Saif Khān, Mallū Khān and other *amīrs* rendered homage to Hasan Khān Shāh-zāda, who was the younger brother of Humāyūn Khān and placed him on the throne, the common people plundered the palace of Humāyūn Khān and set fire to it. Humāyūn Khān determined on flight 3 with 80 horsemen. It so happened that on the way elephant drivers (*filbānān*) and officers of the bed-chamber and of the private apartment (*pardādārān*) and other retainers (*sāyer ahl-i-hashm*) saw him and hastened to join his service. Hasan Khān sitting on the throne saw Humāyūn Khān enter the palace, and fear overwhelmed him, and he could not sit firmly on that great place, and

---

before that, been made the *vakil-us-saltanat*, and who was well known for his intelligence and knowledge of affairs, fled before 'Alā-ud-dīn's death, and went to his son, who after the death of Qāsim Beg Saf-shikan, had received the title of Malik-ut-tujjār, and was the Subahdār of Danlatābād and Junnir, and from there, before even the news of the death of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn had arrived, they went away to Gujrāt.

The above is a translation from the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*; but Col. Briggs does not mention Nizām-ul-mulk or his son by name, but says "Several of the nobles made their escape to Guzerat before the king's death, to avoid the tyranny of his successor".

1 *Firishtah* does not give the date of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn's death, but the year is 862 A.H. as in the text. Mr. Sewell (page 98) says "'Alā-ud-dīn died February 13th, A.D. 1458 (?)". He says in a note "*Firishtah* says that he reigned 23 years, 9 months and 20 days which gives this date. The *Burhān-i-Ma'āsir* fixes his decease at the end of Jamādī-ul-āwwal 862 A.H., which answers to April, 1458 A.D.". As will be seen a little further down, according to Nizām-ud-dīn, Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn reigned for 23 years and 9 months and 22 days, i.e. 2 days longer than the period mentioned by *Firishtah*.

2 *Firishtah*'s account agrees, but he says that the *amīrs* kept the fact of the death of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn concealed; and Shāh Habib-ul-lah, son of Khalīl-ul-lah (who had come from Kirmān in Persia, on the invitation of Sultān Ahmad Shāh,—See note 1, page 55) and others also joined them.

3 The words are عزیمت مزیمت نمود. *Firishtah*, however, says با غارت گران جنگ کرد, i.e., gave battle to the plunderers; and the plunderers being defeated took shelter with Hasan Khān. Humāyūn pursued them and entered the palace.

came down from it. <sup>1</sup>The *amīrs* and *vazīrs* and all the others then kissed the ground of service; and (Humāyūn Khān) sat on the throne. The first order that he gave was <sup>2</sup>this, that they should tie Saif Khān to the foot of an elephant; and drag him through the whole city. Mallū Khān, seeing this (barbarous) punishment fled, and took shelter in a corner.

The period of his (i.e., Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn's) reign was twenty-three years, nine months and twenty-two days.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN HUMĀYŪN SHĀH, SON OF SULTĀN 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN.

The *amīrs* and *maliks* with great unwillingness and reluctance placed their heads of loyalty and their foreheads of fealty on the ground of service. Sultān Humāyūn Shāh although he was well known for great bravery and manliness, and distinguished for eloquence of speech and sweetness of tongue, and bravery, and courage, yet was harsh and malevolent in his temper. He showed great excess in committing sins, and great deficiency in the payment of just dues. He was sound in wisdom and policy, but barbarous and cruel in the punishment of criminals and offenders. Although he was ferocious and wrathful, the sanity of his judgment was such, that every project that he sketched out on the board of his mind, with the pen of thought, resulted according to his anticipation. When he took his place on the throne of empire, he devoted all his energy to the appointment of a perfect and wise *vazīr*; and he laid down, that the ascent up the gradations of rule and the steps of empire is not possible, except with the help and assistance of a *vazīr*, of whose world-adorning wisdom, the structure of the empire and the amelioration of the condition of the *raiyyats* would be the result; and the increase of the revenue and the administration of the army would be the fruits

---

<sup>1</sup> The reading is the same in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., but the sentence appears to me to be incomplete, as it does not say before whom the *amīrs* kissed the ground, and who sat on the throne.

<sup>2</sup> According to Firishtah he ordered that Shāh Habīb-ul-lah and other should be cast into prison. Mallū Khān sought his way to the frontier of the Carnātic. Col. Briggs says that Hasan Khān's eyes were put out, but I cannot find this in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

of whose mature deliberations. He entrusted the duties of the *vazīr* to <sup>1</sup> *Khwāja Najm-ud-dīn Qāran Gilānī*, who was a wise and understanding man, experienced and God-fearing; and the reins of binding and loosening and the tying and untying of all matters of the government of the country were placed in the grasp of his power; and the title of *Malik-ut-tujjār* was conferred on him.

And in the spring time of his (*i.e.*, *Humāyūn Khān's*) rule, <sup>2</sup> *Sikandar Khān Bukhārī*, who had formerly rebelled against Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, and had joined Sultān Mahmūd *Khaljī* became ashamed and repentant, and forgetting the duties of allegiance, made the field of the government of *Humāyūn Shāh* dark with the dust of disturbance; and having raised the standard of rebellion, went away to <sup>3</sup> *Mālkonda* with a large force. *Humāyūn Shāh* determined to march to *Mālkonda*, and sent <sup>4</sup> *Khān Jahān* two stages in advance of himself. *Sikandar Khān* saw that *Khān Jahān* was weak, and attacked him with force and violence; and defeated him. <sup>5</sup> On the following

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the name in the MSS. In the lith. ed. it is *خواجہ نجم الدین* *Qārān Gīlānī*, where *Najm-ud-dīn* is written by mistake as *سنجم الدین* *Sanjam-ud-dīn*. *Firishtah*, however, says that in accordance with the late Sultān's direction, Sultān *Humāyūn* made *Khwāja Mahmūd Gāwān*, the *Malik-ut-tujjār*, and the *Vakil-ush-shāhī*, and the *tarafdār* of *Bijāpūr*. *M. Hidayat Hosain* has *محمد* after *Qārān* in the text.

<sup>2</sup> *Nizām-ud-dīn* does not explain the reason of *Sikandar Khān's* new rebellion. It appears from *Firishtah* that *Sikandar Khān*, who was a companion of Sultān *Humāyūn*, when the latter was yet *shūh-ūda*, fully expected to be made *sipāh-sālār* of *Tilang*, but when he found that *Malik Shāh*, who was a descendant of one of the great men among the *Mughals*, and according to some a descendant of the Sultāns of the family of *Chengīz Khān* was made *Khwāja Jahān* and *tarafdār* of *Tilang*; and a nephew of 'Imād-ul-mulk *Ghurī* was made a commander of a thousand horse, and received *jāgīrs* in *Tilang*: he was disappointed, and left the court, without asking for permission, and went to his father at *Nālkanda*; and the latter had no alternative, but to collect men to support his son.

<sup>3</sup> The name is *Mālkonda* or *Balkonda* in the MSS. and the lith. ed. *Firishtah* calls it *نلکنده*, *Nalkanda*, and *Col. Briggs* has *Nowlgoonda*.

<sup>4</sup> According to *Firishtah*, he was the governor of *Berār*, and had come to offer congratulations to the Sultān on his accession.

<sup>5</sup> The account of the expedition, and the battle as given by *Firishtah* is different from and more elaborate than that given by *Nizām-ud-dīn*. According to him *Sikandar Khān* met *Khān Jahān* and defeated him. Then *Humāyūn*

day, when the standards of the dawn rose over the eastern horizon, Humāyūn Shāh arrayed his army, and advanced to the field of battle and slaughter. After the two armies had met, and the flame of battle had flared up, the breeze of victory and triumph blew on the standards of Humāyūn Shāh, and the enemy fled into the desert of dishonour; and a number of them were crushed under the feet of the elephant of death. Sikandar Khān also fell down from the seat of his saddle on the bed of the ground. Jalāl Khān Bukhārī fled from the battle-field and shut himself up in the fort of Mālkonda. When the Sultān arrived in the neighbourhood of that place, he obtained a safe conduct, and carried his life away to safety from the danger-zone of the (Sultān's) wrath. The Sultān returned to his capital.

In the year 863 A.H., when the tyranny of Humāyūn Shāh became patent to all, the Rāys of Tilang placed their feet outside the circle of allegiance, and shortened their arms in the payment of the stipulated tribute. Humāyūn Shāh conferred the title of

---

Shāh marched in person and encamped in front of Nalkonda. He waited for Jalāl Khān and Sikandar Khān to come and render him homage, when Sikandar Khān made a night attack on the Sultān's camp and did some damage. The next morning the Sultān advanced to seize the fort; but Sikandar Khān advanced with seven thousand or eight thousand horsemen and met him. Humāyūn Shāh sent him a message, that it would not be right for him to fight with his benefactor; and offered him any *pargana* he might choose in Daulatābād as his *jāgīr*, if he would only make his submission. Sikandar Khān replied that if Humāyūn Shāh was Ahmad Shāh's son's son, he was his daughter's son; if the Sultān would give him the country of Tilang well and good; otherwise he should be ready for battle. Then Humāyūn Shāh became angry, and prepared for battle; and Sikandar Khān did the same. Sikandar Khān fought bravely, and the battle continued all day, when Malik-ut-tujjār Gāwān and Khwāja Jahān Turk attacked Sikandar Khān from the right and left wing; and Humāyūn Shāh attacked him in the centre. Sikandar Khān like an infuriated tiger attacked Humāyūn Shāh, and routed his companions. As the elephant on which Humāyūn Shāh was riding was killing many warriors Sikandar Khān attacked it with his spear, when the elephant caught him by the trunk and threw him on the ground; and his own followers who were riding close behind him trampled on him and killed him. Humāyūn Shāh then sent men in pursuit of the routed enemy. Nalkonda was then besieged; and Jalāl Khān surrendered it with much treasure. His life was spared, but he was kept in imprisonment

<sup>1</sup> Khwāja Jahān on Malik Shāh, a Turkī slave, and sent him to the country of Tilang, and Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī was sent with him; and the Sultān himself followed with twenty thousand horsemen and forty elephants. Khwāja Jahān besieged the fort of Deorkonda. The garrison prayed for help from the Rāy of Orissa, agreeing to pay him a large sum of money for it. The Rāy sent a grand army with one hundred elephants. Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī said "We should go away from the foot of the fort, and station ourselves in the open field, before the Rāy of Orissa arrives". Khwāja Jahān who had no experience, considered the opinion of Nizām-ul-mulk unreasonable, and remained where he was. The next day, when the light-giving sun rose over the eastern horizon, the Rāy of Orissa and the garrison attacked Khwāja Jahān from the two sides; and he was defeated. He fled eighty *karōhs* and joined Humāyūn Shāh. He represented to the latter that the defeat was due to Nizām-ul-mulk's

---

<sup>1</sup> As we have seen, Khwāja Jahān had already been employed in the war against Sikandar Khān. Firishtah's description of him has already been given in note 2, page 77. Firishtah says that Humāyūn Shāh attacked Deorkonda, because the Talangi zamindārs who held it had been on friendly terms with Sikandar Khān. He sent the two officers named to attack it, and himself went to Warangal. (Warangal, however, appears to be a long way beyond Deorkonda.) The garrison made several sallies, but were defeated each time; and when they were in considerable distress, they prayed for help from the Rāy of Orissa. He sent a large body of men and also some elephants of war and sent an announcement of his own approach. Then Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī and Khwāja Jahān had a conference. Nizām-ul-mulk gave the advice which is mentioned in the text. Khwāja Jahān said that if they moved away the Talings would pursue them, and they should therefore prepare for battle where they were. Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī had to remain silent. Then the battle took place, and both Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī and Khwāja Jahān fled to Humāyūn Shāh at Warangal. Khwāja Jahān falsely ascribed the defeat to Nizām-ul-mulk; and Humāyūn Shāh, without any inquiry, ordered him to be put to death; and his relations and adherents went and joined Sultān Mahmūd Khālji. Khwāja Jahān was imprisoned in a fort. Humāyūn Shāh was intending to send another army to Deorkonda, when news came from Ahmadābād that Yūsuf Turk had taken Hasan Khān and Shāh Habīb-ul-Jah towards the language of Bīr.

There is a curious resemblance between the language of Firishtah in some of the above sentences to that of Nizām-ud-dīn; and it appears to me that he copied from the latter; though of course in other places his accounts are more logical and accurate.



action; and Humāyūn Shāh's disposition turned against Nizām-ul-mulk, and he spoke unbecoming words to the latter; who fled and joined Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī. Humāyūn Shāh also cast Khwāja Jahān from favour, and made him over to a jailor. And according to another statement, Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī was put to death with great contumely; and his associates and tribesmen went and joined Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī.

In the year 864 A.H., Humāyūn Shāh again determined on the conquest of Tilang. On the way seven of the special associates of Amīrzāda <sup>1</sup>Muhibb-ud-dīn Habib-ul-lah, who on account of some

<sup>1</sup> There appears to be some confusion in the names. We know Shāh Habib-ul-lah and Shāh Muhibb-ul-lah, but not Amīrzāda Muhibb-ud-dīn. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has Shāh Habib-ul-lah. There is not much difference between Nizām-ud-dīn's account and that of Firishtah, as to the way in which the release of Shāh Habib-ul-lah and Shāhzāda Hasan Khān was effected. But the seven adherents of Shāh Habib-ul-lah, who are called his *مختصان*, intimate friends, in the *Ṭabaqāt* are called specifically his *مريدان* or disciples. Malik Yūsuf Turk is called Yūsuf Turk Kachāl. Then again the *حصار* citadel, in which the prison was located, is called the *دربار شاهی* by Firishtah, and the *seraglio* by Col. Briggs. It appears also from Firishtah's account, that the original intention of the conspirators was to effect the release of Shāh Habib-ul-lah alone; and they released Hasan Khān and Yehayā Khān and Jalāl Khān Bukhārī, because they begged them to do so. Firishtah also says (contrary to Nizām-ud-dīn's account) that it was after these men had been released, that the seven thousand other prisoners were set free.

There is, up to this again, a curious similarity between the languages of Nizām-ud-dīn, and Firishtah; and the latter, as the later author, appears to me to have copied from the former.

The subsequent movements of Hasan Khān and Shāh Habib-ul-lah, some of which are not mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn, are thus described by Firishtah. After leaving the city, they remained for six or seven days in the garden of Kamthānū, which was three *karōhs* from Ahmadābād Bidar. Then with three thousand horsemen and five thousand foot-soldiers they attempted to seize the citadel of Ahmadābād Bidar, but finding this to be difficult they went towards the town of Bīr, and took possession of the country around. Yūsuf Turk was made *Amīr-ul-umrā* and Shāh Habib-ul-lah *vazīr*; and they commenced to collect troops.

Humāyūn Shāh now returned to Ahmadābād Bidar, and he put the three thousand soldiers, whom he had left to guard the city, to death with much torture; and he put the *kotwāl* in an iron cage and had one of his limbs cut off

heavenly catastrophe had become dispersed like the constellation of the Bear again became united like the Pleiades; and as in the time of prosperity, they had been partakers of his wealth, they spoke among themselves, that as that moon of the sky of bravery was in eclipse, what use was there in life. It was right that they should think out a plan for his release. They went to Malik Yūsuf Turk, who among the slaves of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn was well known for his honesty and piety and famous for his good deeds and his devotion to God, and the cup of whose hopes had always been filled with the wine of the benefaction of the *Amīr-āda*; and lifted the veil from the face of their plan. That worthy man joined with them, and made some of the guards his confederates; and having waited for a proper opportunity, went with twelve horsemen and fifty foot-soldiers to the gate of the citadel. When the time of the afternoon prayer passed, he dismounted from his horse, and after performing the prescribed devotions, prayed to the great and holy God for success and help. About the time of sunset they went close to the gate. Most of the guards had gone away on their various businesses, and the few who remained stretched out their hands to forbid and stop them. Malik Yūsuf Turk acted with courtesy and gentleness; and showed them a *farmān* with a red seal, as is the custom with all *farmāns* in the Dakin, which he had prepared beforehand and had taken with him; and so they passed through the first gate. When they arrived at the second (*i.e.*, the inner) gate, the guards met them with hostility and resistance, and although the forged *farmān* was shown to them,

---

every day. He was compelled to eat it, and he was taken round the city till he died. After that Humāyūn Shāh sent eight thousand horsemen and an enormous number of infantry against his brother Ḥasan Khān. A battle took place outside the town of Bīr, in which through the exertions of Shāh Ḥabīb-ul-lah, Ḥasan Khān was victorious. Then Humāyūn Shāh sent more troops. His natural ferocity now blazed up, and he sent the army, which had accompanied him to Tilang, to Bīr, keeping the wives and children of the officers as hostages, so that they might not join Ḥasan Khān. Another battle was fought; and Ḥasan Khān was defeated, and he went away with six or seven hundred soldiers to Bījāpūr. There Sirāj Khān Junaidī treacherously seized them. Shāh Ḥabīb-ul-lah suffered martyrdom, while resisting his capture; but Prince Ḥasan Khān and the others were sent prisoners to Aḥmadābād Bīdar.

they did not accept it, and said that there should be a *parwāna* (an order or permit) from the *kotwāl*. Malik Yūsuf immediately cut off the head of the chief guard with his sword, and entered the citadel. There was great tumult, and in the first instance they went to the big prison and broke down the gate. About seven thousand prisoners including Saīyids and learned and wise men and men of the middle class who were confined in that prison considered it a great boon; and each one went to his own nook and corner.

They then went from that place, and releasing *Amīrzāda* Ḥabīb-ul-lah, and the sons of the Sultāns, and Jalāl Khān Bukhārī, each one went away in a separate direction. The *kotwāl* (Police Superintendent) of the city seized Jalāl Khān Bukhārī, who was eighty years of age, and Yaḥya Khān, a son of Sultān 'Alā'-ud-dīn, and put them to death with great torment and torture. Ḥasan Khān and *Amīrzāda* Ḥabīb-ul-lah went to the house of a barber, who had been in the service of the latter, and had their heads shaved off, in the manner of *qalandars* (*faqīrs*, mendicants). The *Amīrzāda* wished to retire into an obscure corner and cover his feet under the skirts of contentment; but as Ḥasan Khān said that the people of the city and the soldiers were on his side, on account of the tyranny and injustice of Humāyūn Shāh, and it was certain that when the falcon of his greatness should spread the wings of fortune he would be able to seize Humāyūn Shāh like a bird whose wings should have been cut, and a wild animal whose legs should have been broken, without trouble and difficulty. As the *Amīrzāda* always fashioned (lit. sewed) a *kulāh* (high cap) of this felt (*i.e.*, had such an ambition himself), he cancelled his original intention; and making strong terms of engagement with Ḥasan Khān, they both went out of the city. Soldiers came to them in large numbers. Humāyūn Shāh on hearing this put his sword into friend and stranger. When he arrived in the city of Bidar, he perpetrated such acts of cruelty, that <sup>1</sup>Ḥajjāj became (in comparison with him) Naushīrwān, the just. His body has perished, but his bad name and the memory of his tyranny have continued in the world. One of his victims made this quatrain about it.

---

<sup>1</sup> A cruel tyrant of Arabia.

<sup>1</sup> Quatrain :

Ah tyrant ! fear the sighs of the heart of sleepless men,  
And fear thy bad deeds and thy evil-inciting spirit.  
Look at the eyelashes, steeped in blood, of thy victim !  
Fear that dagger sharp, that drips with blood !

When the news of the return of Humāyūn Shāh reached *Shāh-zāda* Ḥasan Khān and *Amirzāda* Ḥabīb-ul-lah, <sup>2</sup> they found themselves to be without the power of withstanding him ; and turned their faces towards Bijāpūr. Sirāj Khān, who afterwards received the title of Muẓẓam Khān behaved towards them with courtesy and flattery ; and presented much tribute ; and after taking oaths took them into the citadel. He then collected a force in the course of the night, and attacked them. The common people became dispersed. Ḥasan Khān and Mir Ḥabīb-ul-lah and the seven friends, who had brought them out of prison, were besieged in a kiosk, in which they had been accommodated. Ḥasan Khān after receiving a safe conduct went to the besiegers ; but *Amirzāda* Ḥabīb-ul-lah, in agreement with his friends, said “ We are all prepared for death ; and the birds of our spirit will not lower their heads into the nest of your safe conduct “. They fought and exerted themselves to the extent of their means, and their strength ; and reached the end and object of their hope (*i.e.*, they heroically met their death).

<sup>3</sup> Humāyūn Shāh when he saw Ḥasan Khān, threw him in his

<sup>1</sup> This quatrain is quoted with some variations by Firishtah also. He says that it was written by the poet Maulāna Nazīrī, who had, according to him, got the title of *Malik-ush-sharā* or the king of poets, apparently in imitation of the *Malik-ut-tujjār*. In the version printed in the lith. ed. of Firishtah the second line is *و از نفس بد شوم شر انگیز ترس*, and the third line is *مرگان دم الودد*. I think the third line as quoted by Nizām-ud-dīn is better. *مظلومان بین*.

<sup>2</sup> But see note 1, page 80, from which it will appear that, according to Firishtah, they fought two battles with Humāyūn Shāh's army, near Bīr and were victorious in the first. Nizām-ud-dīn omits all mention of what happened near Bīr.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah mentions the atrocities which were perpetrated by Humāyūn Shāh on the companions of Ḥasan Khān, who were sent to Ahnādābād Bīdar by Sirāj Khān. It appears from Firishtah that Shāh Ḥabīb-ul-lah alone attained to martyrdom ; and the others including Yūsuf Turk, and down to

own presence before a tiger. <sup>1</sup> Saiyid Tūhir, the poet has said the following chronogram on the date of the death of *Amīrzāda* Ḥabīb-ul-lah.

Qumtrain :

In the month of Shu'bān, in India, to martyrdom attained,  
Ḥabīb-ul-lah (Ḥāzī), may his tomb be sanctified !  
The mind of Tūhir, sought the date of his death ;  
He found it in *rāh-i-pāk-i-Na'mat-ul-lah* !

(the holy spirit of Na'mat-ul-lah).

Saiyid Na'mat-ul-lah was Shāh Ḥabīb-ul-lah's great ancestor. They say that Sirāj Khān was afflicted with leprosy in the course of a short time.

Then, in short, in the year 865 A.H., when the tyranny of Humāyūn Shāh reached to such a pitch, that he stretched out his hands to wives and children of other men ; and he became the slave of his lust. Sometimes he ordered that a bride should be seized on the road ; and should be brought into his seraglio, and he after satisfying his lust, sent the woman to the house of her husband ; and sometimes he put the members of the harem to death without any cause. The *amīrs* became suspicious of him to such a degree, that whenever they went to make their *salāms* (homage) to him, they first of all gave directions to their sons, before placing their feet on the road.  
(At last) <sup>2</sup> Shitāb Khān who was the guardian of the seraglio

even the menials such as *farāshes*, water-carriers and sweepers were sent to Ahmadābad Bidar ; where they were put to death with cruel torture ; and their wives and children, and others in any way connected with Humān Khān were also put to death with unheard-of and unnumbered cruelties.

<sup>1</sup> Firishlah calls him Saiyid Tūhir Antarābādī, and he also quotes the chronogram.

<sup>2</sup> Firishlah has two versions of the circumstances of Humāyūn Shāh's death. One is that he became ill, and that when he had no hope of his surviving the illness, he made his eldest son, Nizām Khān, his heir ; and he released Khwājah Juhān Turk from prison, and sent for the Malik-ul-Jajir from Tibung ; and appointed the former to be *nāib-i-shahī*, and the latter to be the *vazir* ; and he directed his son always to act under the guidance of his mother. The other version is somewhat like that given by Nizām-ul-din but it is said that Humāyūn Shāh had been ill, and was murdered after his recovery. The guardian of the harem is called Shitāb Khān even in the lith. ed. of Firishlah.

associated some *Ḥabshīs* with him, and on the night of the <sup>1</sup> 27th *Dhīqa'dah* of the aforementioned year, one of the female *Ḥabshī* slaves struck Humāyūn Shāh, when he was resting in the seraglio, on the head with a piece of wood and made him like those who had been dead a thousand years ago.

Couplet :

In this turquoise palace with calamities filled,  
For evil, evil ever is the recompense sure.

The poet Naẓīrī, who was the friend and companion of *Amīrzāda Ḥabīb-ul-lah*, and who had been delivered from captivity by the kind exertions of Malik Yūsuf Turk, wrote this verse on the date of the death of Humāyūn Shāh.

<sup>2</sup> Verses ;

Humāyūn Shāh is dead, the day has pleasant become ;  
God is great ; oh happy and auspicious death !  
The earth is full of flavour new. The date of the death,  
Bring out e'en from *Dhaug-i-jahān*.

The word *Dhaug-i-jahān* (flavour of the world) becomes the date of his death.

The period of his reign was <sup>3</sup> three years and six months and five days.

It is also said that Humāyūn Shāh was killed when he was sleeping after drinking some intoxicating liquor. Col. Briggs gives the second version somewhat briefly, and does not give the name of the eunuch.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah has 28th *Dhīqa'dah*, 865. Col. Briggs gives September 3rd, 1461, as the corresponding date of the Christian era. Mr. Sewell also gives the 28th *Dhīqa'dah*, of course from Firishtah ; but he has the 5th September, 1461 A.D., as the corresponding English date.

<sup>2</sup> This verse has also been quoted by Firishtah, who, however, substitutes *دوست عالم*, i.e., the world has been saved, for *روز خوش شد* at the end of the first line ; and *تاریخ مرگش* for *تاریخ فوتش*.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah has three years six months and six days, as according to him the death took place on the 28th and not on the 27th *Dhīqa'dah*. See note 1. above.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF NIZĀM SHĀH, SON OF  
HUMĀYŪN SHĀH.

When Nizām Shāh in his eighth year sat in his father's place, the establishment of the rules of government and the strengthening of the acts of administration were entrusted in the hands of <sup>1</sup> *Makhdūma-i-Jahān*; and that <sup>2</sup> veiled one behind the curtain of chastity directed all her energies in furnishing the bed of equity and justice; and shortened the hand of the tyrant from the skirt of his victim. But as owing to the great oppression of Humāyūn Shāh, the hearts of men were wounded and lacerated, the work of government could not be regulated and organized.

At this time, the <sup>3</sup> Rāy of Orissa, having received information of

<sup>1</sup> The widow of Humāyūn Shāh and the mother of Nizām Shāh, whom Firishtah describes as a *عالمه زن* or a wise woman.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah describes how, every morning, the two ministers Khwājah Jahān and Malik-ut-tujjār Gāwān went to the palace and through the intervention of a woman of the name of Māh Bānū, they had a conference with the queen-mother; and then they took the young Sultān and placed him on the turquoise throne, and carried out the administration on the lines which had been determined upon in consultation with the queen-mother.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah says, the Rāy of the *اوریسہ و اوریہ* in concert with zamīndārs of Tilang came to conquer the country of the Dakin, by way of Rājahmandri; and they laid waste all the country as far as Kulās. I cannot say exactly what the word after *اوریسہ*, which looks like *اوریا* Auriyā or Uriyā is, and whether the Rāy of Orissa and Auriyā represent one Rāy or two Rāys. Firishtah has the two words all through his account, but Col. Briggs does not mention Auriyā. Firishtah's account agrees with Nizām-ud-dīn's as to the main incident, namely the attack of Shāh Muhibb-ul-lah on the vanguard of the Orissa army. But before coming to that he says that, Nizām Shāh's advisers proceeded with great calmness to collect troops, and they got together forty thousand horsemen and marched to the camp of the Rāy of Orissa and Auriyā, taking the young Sultān with them. The Rāy intended to take possession of the territories, and then after extorting tribute to return to his own kingdom. But Nizām Shāh's ministers sent word to him that they intended to invade and conquer Jājnagar and Orissa and Auriyā; but that as he had now invaded the Dakin, matters had become easy for them; and unless he paid tribute, and restored whatever his men had seized, not one of the latter would be allowed to return in safety. Immediately after this Shāh Muhibb-ul-lah, who had come to carry on a *jehāp* (religious war), fell on the vanguard of the Orissa army. The action is

the state of things, came forward with a large body of cavalry and infantry to plunder and ravage Bidar; and by successive marches came within thirty *korōhs* of the city. The *amīrs*, in spite of the fact that they were unprepared, marched out for the campaign, taking the eight-year old Nizām Shāh with them. When the distance (between the two) was only eight *korōhs*, Amīrzāda Muhibb-ul-lah with only one hundred and sixty brave and well-armed men separated himself from the army of Nizām Shāh, and advancing forward fell upon the vanguard of the Rāy of Orissa, which consisted of ten thousand infantry and four hundred horsemen. From morning till the time of midday they fought with courage and bravery, till in the end, the breeze of victory and triumph blew on the standard of the Ghāzis; and the vanguard of the Orissa army fled and joined the main army. The Rāy of Orissa marched away at night, and returned to his dominion. The *amīrs* carried out the customary thanksgiving to God, and returned at the stirrups of Nizām Shāh.

They had not yet settled down at Bidar when Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī at the instigation of Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī invaded the

---

described by Firishtah in almost the same words as Nizām-ul-dīn, but Firishtah goes on to say that the Dakin army pursued the Orissa army, which lost two or three thousand men daily. So the Rāy took shelter in a fort, and sent messages expressive of his distress; and finally agreed to pay five lakhs of silver *tankas*. Col. Briggs says in his translation that the threatening message was sent with Shāh Muhibb-ul-lah "but his escort being stopped by the infidels he charged the Rāy's advanced pickets so boldly, that supposing the whole army was in motion the Hindoos fell back on their main body". I cannot find anything in the lith. ed. of Firishtah which agrees with this. There is nothing in it about the message being taken by Shāh Muhibb-ul-lah. In fact it appears that Shāh Muhibb-ul-lah only joined the army to carry on a *jehūd* or religious war. Col. Briggs also says in a note that Firishtah hastily adopted the language of Moalla Dawood of Bidar and other historians of the Bahmany dynasty, and "has not exercised any discretion or even much research in not endeavouring to account for the sudden retreat of the Hindoos". I do not quite agree with Col. Briggs. There were many instances of such panic and sudden retreat in the case of the Rāys of Bijānagar and others.

<sup>1</sup> This is mentioned by Firishtah, but not by Col. Briggs. Firishtah also says that Sultān Maḥmūd advanced with twenty-eight thousand horsemen and the Rāy of Orissa and Auriyā and the Rāys of Talingāna advanced at the same time. Nizām Shāh's ministers sent the Talingāna army against the Rāy of



Deccan, and began to advance by successive marches. The *amirs*, taking Nipām Shāh with them, advanced to meet the army of Mandū. When there was a distance of three *farṣakhs* (between the two armies) Nipām Shāh nominated ten thousand horsemen to the right wing and placed them in charge of Khwājah Mahmūd Gīlāni, who had the title of Malik-ut-tujjār. The left wing was made over to Malik Nipām-ul-mulk; and he himself took up his stand in the centre with eleven thousand horsemen: and one hundred elephants. The superintendence of the centre of the army was made over to Khwājah Jahān Malik Shāh Turk. Sulṭān Mahmūd Khaljī divided his twenty-eight thousand horsemen into three detachments, and advanced to the field of battle and bloodshed. After the two armies had met, Malik-ut-tujjār advancing rapidly fell upon the left wing of the Khaljī army. Mahshār Khān, the governor of Chandār, and Zahir-ul-mulk, the nazir, who commanded the left wing of that army were killed on the battle-field: and a great defeat fell on the army of Mandū; so that Malik-ut-tujjār pursued it for two *ḥorās*, and plundered the Khaljī camp.

---

Orissa and Aurjā and the Rāys of Talingāna: and themselves advanced with the armies of Bijāpur, Daulatābād and Berār, at the summons of Nipām Shāh against Sulṭān Mahmūd. The two armies met at the neighbourhood of the fort of Qandahār. Firishah mentions the attack by the Malik-ut-tujjār, whom, however, he calls Mahmūd Gāwān, on the left wing of the Mandū army: and says that although Mahshār Khān and Zahir-ul-mulk fought bravely, they were at last compelled to retire and were killed. He also mentions the attack of the left wing of the Dakini army under Nipām-ul-mulk Turk, on the right wing of the Mandū army which was led by Shāhrāds Shīrās-ud-dīn. This is not mentioned by Nipām-ud-dīn. They fought bravely, but the *Sikandar* was wounded and was thrown from his horse, and was about to be killed when he was rescued. This wing of the Mandū army was thus defeated and was pursued by the Dakini army: and the camp was looted, and fifty elephants were seized. Sulṭān Mahmūd seeing both wings of his army routed, determined on retiring to Mandū but one of the *amirs* dissuaded him. At this time Nipām Shāh wanted bravely to attack the centre of the Māwa army. Khwājah Jahān stopped him, but after a time he advanced with ten thousand horsemen to attack the centre of Sulṭān Mahmūd's army, which consisted of twelve thousand horsemen. At this time Sulṭān Mahmūd hit the forehead of an elephant, which Sikandar Khān a Turki slave of Khwājah Jahān was riding. The elephant became furious, and trampled on many men belonging to the Dakini army: and it was likely

At this time, when the men were engaged in plundering, Sultān Mahmūd appeared before Nizām Shāh's army with twelve thousand horsemen. Khwājah Jahān Turk, who was the leader of the centre of the army, turned round, and seizing the bridle of the Sultān's horse turned towards Bidar; and in spite of the fact that Malik-ut-tajjūr had been victorious over the Mālwa army, the army of Nizām Shāh was defeated; and the men who were engaged in plundering were slain at the spot where they were. Mulkah-i-Jahān being apprised of the treachery and deceit of Khwājah Jahān, entrusted the defence of the fort of Bidar to Mallū Khān, and took Nizām Shāh with her to Firzābād. Sultān Mahmūd pursued the army of the Deccan as

---

that Nizām Shāh himself should receive some injury. Then Sikandar Khān, either through foolishness or through some enmity which he had against Khwājah Jahān, did not exhort the army to fight, but carried away Nizām Shāh, whether he liked it or not, placing him behind himself on the same elephant and they stood a short distance behind the army. The amīrs not seeing the standard of the Sultān in its place turned round one after another, and taking Nizām Shāh, who was standing in a corner, with them went back to the capital.

The above is Firishtah's version of the engagement in the lith. ed. It will be seen that the account of the latter part of the battle, and of the way in which Nizām Shāh was taken away from the field, differs materially from that given by Nizām-ud-dīn.

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishtah there was no doubt at least at that time about the good faith or behaviour of Khwājah Jahān. The only question was about the conduct of Sikandar Khān. Firishtah says that the queen-mother at first praised him for having brought her son out of danger; but when he went to see Khwājah Jahān, the latter ordered him to be imprisoned, for having brought Nizām Shāh away at such an inopportune moment. The other Turkī slaves however went to the queen-mother, and defended the conduct of Sikandar Khān. She sympathised with them, but expressed her inability to do anything just then. Khwājah Jahān hearing of this, sent Sikandar Khān to her, and he was ordered to be set at liberty.

Firishtah, however, goes on to say that the queen-mother had suspicions of the treachery and deceit of Khwājah Jahān, and knew the defeat was due to his want of firmness and courage; and therefore with the advice of Malik-ut-tajjūr Mahmūd Gāwān (or Gilānī), she placed the defence of the citadel of Ahmadābād Bidar in charge of Mallū Khān. Firishtah goes on to say that Sultān Mahmūd of Mālwa took the fort of Bidar after a siege of seventeen days, and took possession of the greater part of Berūr and Daulatābād; so that people thought that the power of the Bahmanīs should pass to the Khaljis, when the news of the approach of the Gujrāt army came.

far as the gate of Bīdar, and having devastated the country outside the fort, occupied himself with providing the necessary apparatus for its capture.

Nizām Shāh had, at the time of starting on the campaign, written a letter in the language of sincerity, giving an account of what was happening to Sultān Maḥmūd of Gujrāt. Now when he was <sup>1</sup>recovering at Fīrūzābād; and the men who had fled had assembled again, he sent Kḥiwājah Jahān with a large army to fight with Sultān Maḥmūd (Kḥalji). About this time information came that Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrātī had arrived at the frontiers of the Deccan, with eighty thousand horsemen. Sultān Maḥmūd Kḥalji, finding that he had not the strength to withstand him, started on the seventeenth day for Mandū, by way of <sup>2</sup> Gōndwāra. Kḥiwājah Jahān

<sup>1</sup> The actual words are در فیروز اباد نفس درست کرد. Firishtah whose language at this part of the narrative resembles that of Nizām-ud-dīn has نفس راست کرد.

<sup>2</sup> The name is گوندواره in one MS., گوندوانه in the other, and گوندوانه, in the lith. ed. Firishtah has گوندواره, but Col. Briggs has Gondwana. Firishtah's account agrees with Nizām-ud-dīn's, almost *verbatim*, up to the mention of the arrival of Sultān Maḥmūd of Gujrāt. After that he goes on to say that Maḥdūma-i-Jahān sent Malik-ut-tujjār Maḥmūd Gāwān with five or six thousand horsemen by way of Bīr, to meet the Sultān of Gujrāt. The latter sent twenty thousand horsemen, with many of his great *amīrs* to co-operate with Malik-ut-tujjār. More soldiers joined him, and then Malik-ut-tujjār advanced with forty thousand Dakinī and Gujrātī horsemen towards Aḥmadābād Bīdar, Sultān Maḥmūd Kḥalji who was engaged in the siege of the citadel, and was fighting daily with Mallū Kḥān, now started for Mandū in great distress. Malik-ut-tujjār sent ten thousand horsemen to Berār to stop the road; and himself with ten thousand Dakinī, and twenty thousand Gujrātī horsemen, advanced to a point between Qandahār and Bīr, where the encampment of the Mālwa army was located, and prevented the importation of grain and other provisions into the camp. Sultān Maḥmūd Kḥalji had thirty thousand horsemen ready for battle, but Malik-ut-tujjār did not meet him, and went on carrying out his own plans, till there were signs of a famine in the Mālwa camp. Sultān Maḥmūd Kḥalji then blinded (کور کرده), Col. Briggs has: killed) the elephants he had with him, and set fire to all his heavy baggage. He then started well-armed and in light marching order having washed his hands of his life (*i.e.*, almost despairing of arriving safely at Mandū). He told the head-man of Gōndwāra, who has with him, to take him along a good road. The



Kāwīl to 'Imād-ul-mulk and Junīr to Nizām-ul-mulk and Māhūr to Khudāwand Khān, in *jāgīr*.

<sup>1</sup> Unlike former Sultāns in the matter of the capture of forts, and the conquest of towns, he did not consider it sufficient merely to have a show of obedience and submission, and the sending of gifts and presents; but he devoted all his attention to measures by which strong forts might come into his possession. In fact the *farmāns* of the rule of the Bahmanī dynasty ended with his great name; <sup>2</sup> and all disturbances and rebellions which had found their way into the kingdom during the reigns of Sultān Humāyūn Shāh and Nizām Shāh were remedied by the grandeur of the personality of Muḥammad Shāh; and all weaknesses and troubles which had crept into the affairs of the kingdom and empire were cured by his attention. After the regulation of the affairs of the empire, he commenced to gratify the hearts of the pillars of the state. He had Khwājah Jahān, who in the invasion of Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī had determined to undermine the foundation of the greatness of this dynasty, and had besides stretched out his hands for taking and misappropriating the government money, <sup>3</sup> executed in front of the palace.

old Sultān. On the other hand, he says that Khwājah Jahān Turk had all the power in his hands. He dispossessed all the ancient *amīrs* of their fiefs; and made them over to new men, who were his own creatures. He even stretched his hands into, and embezzled the government funds. He kept Malik-ut-tujjār Muḥammad Gāwān constantly employed on the frontier; and did not allow him to have any share in the great affairs of state. It was the queen-mother, who impressed the dishonesty and disloyalty of Khwājah Jahān on the Sultān's mind; and arranged for getting rid of him. It appears, moreover, that according to Firishtah, Muḥammad Shāh could not even give the order for the execution of Khwājah Jahān, when everything had been previously arranged, without being specially reminded by his mother, through two old women.

<sup>1</sup> The meaning and logical sequence of these sentences is not very clear.

<sup>2</sup> There is some difference in the readings. I have retained that in the lith. ed. but the MSS. have instead of *بتوجه او صلاح* *بقرشکوة وجود محمد شاه* *بتوجه او صلاح پذیرفت* simply *پذیرفت*.

<sup>3</sup> See the latter part of note 2, above.

<sup>1</sup> He appointed <sup>2</sup> Malik Nizām-ul-mulk the governor of Jūnir to conquer the fort of Kehrā which now belonged to the rulers of Mandū, after giving him a special robe of honour. Malik Nizām-ul-mulk arranged his army, and then with a large body of men traversed the various stages, and encamped on the bank of the river which flows at the foot of the fort. <sup>3</sup> The Mandū army sallied out of the fort, and commenced the battle; but afterwards again fled into the fort. Nizām-ul-mulk's soldiers pursued them to the gate of the fort. The garrison finding the grandeur and great strength of Nizām-ul-mulk's army prayed for safe conduct. Nizām-ul-mulk granted it, and when they were brought out of the fort he gave *pān*

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishlah this expedition did not take place till the year 872 A.H., 1467 A.D., i.e., nearly four years after Muḥammad Shāh's accession; and in the meantime, Malik-ut-tujjār Muḥammad Gāwān was made Khwājah Jahān and *amīr-ul-amrā* and *rakīl-us-saltanat*; and when Muḥammad Shāh was fourteen years of age the queen-mother arranged for his marriage, which was celebrated with great grandeur and eclat. After this the queen-mother retired from active participation in the affairs of the state; and devoted herself to devotional duties. But even now Muḥammad Shāh did not put his hand to any important affair, till he had consulted her; and went every morning to offer his respects to her.

<sup>2</sup> He was made the سپہ سالار, commander of the army of Berār; but Col. Briggs makes him the governor of that territory.

<sup>3</sup> Firishlah's account is different. According to him Nizām-ul-mulk defeated the army, which had come from Mandū, to aid the garrison on the last occasion, when twelve thousand Afghāns and Rājputs fought a great battle with the Dakinīs in front of the fort; but were signally defeated when the garrison which had sallied out to join in the fight attempted to re-enter the fort, Nizām-ul-mulk and a small number of his soldiers pursued them, and got into the fort, and seized it. According to another version, the garrison being disheartened surrendered the fort; and were allowed to leave it in safety. At this time, some of the Dakinīs abused and taunted the Mālwa soldiers. Two Rājputs who were in the garrison determined to show their courage. After the fort had been evacuated, they went near the crowd that surrounded Nizām-ul-mulk, and said that they had never seen a great man like him; and they wanted to show their respect by kissing his feet. Nizām-ul-mulk seeing that they had no arms, allowed them to approach him, when they snatched a dagger and a sword with great activity; and each of them inflicted a wound, and slew Nizām-ul-mulk. They attacked and slew others also, and fought till they were both slain.

(betel) to each one of them with his own hand. When this was going on, a man after taking the *pān*, struck Nizām-ul-mulk with his dagger, and made him a martyr. <sup>1</sup> 'Ādil Khān and Daryā Khān, who were his two accomplished sons, slew the governor of the fort and the entire garrison; and placing a man in whom they had every trust, in the fort, and taking the dead body of their father with them, went to render homage to Muḥammad Shāh. After they had had

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah calls them Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān Sawāī, who became the ancestor of the 'Ādil Shāhī Sultāns, and Daryā Khān Turk; and says that they were his adopted brothers, and not sons; and also says, that they believed that the Rājapūts had killed Nizām-ul-mulk at the instigation of the commandant of the fort; and sent men in pursuit of the garrison, who had encamped one *korōh* from the fort, and were altogether unprepared; and every one of them, young and old, was killed.

Firishtah goes on to say that the Sultān of Mālwa sent a man of the name of Sharif-ul-mulk, with valuable presents, to represent that Sultān Aḥmad Bahmanī and Sultān Hūshang had entered into an agreement, that Berār should appertain to the Bahmanī kingdom, and Kehrla and its dependencies to Mālwa, so that there might be no further disputes. Now the *amirs* of the Dakin had seized on Kehrla. If the matter be so arranged that there might be no breach of the previous agreement, there would be friendship and brotherliness between the two kingdoms. Sultān Muḥammad sent Shāh Shaikh Aḥmad the *Ṣadr*, with Sharif-ul-mulk to Mandū; and pointed out that the Bahmanī Sultāns were not in need of any fort like Kehrla, as there were many such forts in the Carnātic, which were in the possession of the *kāfirs*, and which they could easily conquer. Besides, the first breach of the agreement was not committed by them but by Sultān Maḥmūd himself, who had invaded the Bahmanī kingdom, when the late Sultān was a boy, and there was dissension among his principal officers. When Shāh Shaikh Aḥmad arrived near Mandū, he was met by the principal officers of the Mandū government, who took him with all respect and honour to the Sultān. When he delivered his message the learned men of Mandū, who were present, and the Sultān himself admitted, that the first breach had been committed by Sultān Maḥmūd himself. An agreement was then concluded and attested by the learned men and the representatives of the two Sultāns, that neither party should henceforward interfere with the other's territory, and the relations between them should be the same as had been agreed upon in the time of Sultān Aḥmad Shāh Bahmanī; and that Kehrla should be restored to Mālwa; and that for future expansion of their kingdoms, there were the territories of the *kāfirs*, which the contracting parties might with divine aid conquer by the sword of *jchūd*. These transactions have not been mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn.

the good fortune of rendering service the rank and fiefs of their father were confirmed to them.

<sup>1</sup> After some days, he conferred a robe of honour and a jewelled belt to the Malik-ut-tujjār; and sent him with some other amīrs to conquer the territory of the Rāy of Sonkar (Sangēsar) and Kokan. When the Malik-ut-tujjār arrived in the town of <sup>2</sup> Kolāpūr, As'ad Khān advanced with his own men from Jūnir and Kishwar Khān from Gulbargah and Dābal, and joined him. He started from that place, in concert with them, and when they arrived at the head of the <sup>3</sup> defile of Kaikanā, they came to a great forest, where on account of the dense growth of the trees, it appeared to be difficult even for ants and snakes to pass through. Malik-ut-tujjār's army cleared every day, a distance of one *farsakh* in breadth, and one bow shot in length. When they arrived in the vicinity of (the foot of) Kaikanā, the height and strength of which were such that the arrow of the plan of no conqueror of forts could reach to the <sup>4</sup> ambition of its conquest, they encamped there. There was a great fight, and the enemy (مُزْدَان), i.e., the refractory people fled and

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishtah this expedition was sent in the beginning of 874 A.H., 1469 A.D., for the punishment according to the lith. ed. of Firishtah of رَاى سَنگِسَر و کِهِنْدِه و تَسخِير دِيگَر قَلَاع کَوکَن, i.e., of the Rāys of Sangesar and Khāna and the conquest of other forts in the Kokan (Coukan). Col. Briggs says that the expedition was "against the Shunkur Ray of Kehna and other refractory rajahs in the Concan". As to Sankar or Sangesar see note 2, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah, lith. ed., has the *pargana* and not the town of کِهولا پور and Col. Briggs the district of Kolapoor. The name of As'ad Khān is doubtful. It is so in the lith. ed.; but one MS. calls him اِسْتَعْدَاد خان Ista'dād Khān and the other omits the name altogether. Firishtah has سَعِيد خان گِيلَانِي Sa'id Khān Gīlānī, but Col. Briggs has Assud Khān. According to Firishtah after Malik-ut-tujjār had taken possession of the *ghāt* or pass, seeing that the cavalry would not be of any use in that country, he sent back the troops whom he had brought from the capital; and took with him only Sa'id Khān Gīlānī, who was of his own tribe, with the army of Junir, and Khush Qadam Khān his own slave, with the army of Dābul and Kalhar.

<sup>3</sup> I cannot find any mention of the تَنگِي کِيکَنِيه, or the defile of Kaikanā in Firishtah. It may be identical with چَنگَل کِهِنْدِه mentioned there.

<sup>4</sup> The actual words are هَمَاى تَسخِير, which means "the ambition of its conquest" as I have translated it.



entered the fort. The army was delayed at the foot of the fort for a period of <sup>1</sup> five months. As the rainy season came on, the *amīrs* after consulting among themselves, returned to Kolāpūr and on their arrival there, they cast the shadow of their good fortune on the capture of the fort of <sup>2</sup> Rangta, and seized it in a short time.

When the rainy season was over, the *amīrs* again directed their attention to the punishment of the Rāy of Sonkar, and when they arrived at the fort of <sup>3</sup> Māchal, they attacked it, and conquered it at the first onset, and many of the rebels were slain, and some of their leaders were seized. When the overwhelming strength and power of the Malik-ut-tujjār became known, the Rāy of Sonkar sent a body of intelligent men to him, and prayed that he would pardon his offences, and he would <sup>4</sup> surrender the fort of Kaikanīa to him. The Malik-ut-tujjār pardoned his offences; and having <sup>5</sup> placed the fort in charge of some trusted adherents, and made a

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have fifty days. The other MS. and Firishtah have پنجاه, five months.

<sup>2</sup> The name of the fort is رنگتہ in one MS. and رنگہ in the other. In the lith. ed. it is رنگیہ. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has رامنگر, and Col. Briggs (vol. II, page 484) has Ramgur.

<sup>3</sup> The fort is called ماچل, Māchal, in one MS., and ماچیل probably Māchīl in the other; and ماحال, Māhāl, in the lith. ed. It does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah's account is rather vague. He says در این کورت بتدبیر و حیلہ بسیار و پاشش درم و دینار بی شمار قلعه کہینہ کہ در ہیچ روزگار کمند خسروان which may be translated as, "This time with many plans and stratagems and the scattering of many *dīrams* and *dīnārs*, the fort of Khīna, to the turrets to the capture of which, the lasso of the mighty emperors had not reached, in any (former) age, was taken." Col. Brigg's (vol. II, page 484) translation is less literal, but he also mentions the stratagems and gifts of money.

<sup>5</sup> Firishtah says that after the capture of the fort Malik-ut-tujjār again left the *ghūti* and the fort in charge of men accustomed to the climate; and stayed for four months, as in the previous year (apparently at Kolāpūr), and then again invaded the territory of the Rāy, and took possession of it without difficulty; and having taken revenge from the *sardārs* for the outrage committed by them on Khalf Ḥasan Baṣrī, the former Malik-ut-tujjār, he started towards the island of Goa.

pecuniary allowance from the revenue of the country, which might be sufficient for the subsistence of the Rāy, he without any hesitation or delay advanced towards the island of <sup>1</sup>Goa, which is a famous port of Bijānagar. He sent by water 120 <sup>2</sup>ships filled with <sup>3</sup>warlike men and in a short time the island came into his possession. When he returned (crowned with victory), and (loaded with) plunder, to the capital, his services were considered to be meritorious, and were acceptable to the Sultān; and the reigns of binding and loosening were placed in his hands of power, and the title of Aʿzam Humāyūn Khwājah Jalān was conferred on him.

As the armies of Muḥammad Shāh <sup>4</sup>Lashkāri were successful wherever they went; and it had been repeatedly heard that in the kingdom of <sup>5</sup>Jai Singh Rāy, proprietor of the fort of Birākar, a mine

<sup>1</sup> Written as **کورو** in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*. In the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*, the name is printed as **کورو**. Mr. Sewell (see page 99 of his book) says, that "In the middle of the year 1469, when Rājasekhara or Virūpāksha I was the king of Vijayanagar, Mahmūd Gawān, Muhammad's minister marched towards the west, and after a fairly successful campaign attacked Goa, then in the possession of the Rāy of Vijaynagar, both by sea and land. He was completely victorious and captured the place."

<sup>2</sup> The reading in one MS. is **۱۲۰ کشتی و بیست چهار** 120 ships, and in the other **۱۰۴ کشتی و بیست و چهار** 104 boats. The lith. ed. has **۱۰۴ کشتی و بیست و چهار** 104 boats. *Firishtah* has the same reading as the first MS., and I have accepted it. *Firishtah* also says that he himself marched by land with his victorious troops and that he returned to Ahmadābād Bidar after the conquest of the Concan and Goa after an absence of three years. The title conferred on Malik-ut-tujjār as described by *Firishtah* was much longer than that given by Nizām-d-dīn. At the same time the Malik-ut-tujjār's slave Khush Qadam had the title of Kishwar Khān conferred on him; and the forts of Goa and Banna (Briggs has Poonda) and Kondwāl and Kolāpūr were added to his former fief.

<sup>3</sup> There is a difference in the readings here. The MSS. have **مملو** which appears to be correct; but the word **راهی** is rather indistinct. The lith. ed. has **نیز راہی** instead of **راہی**.

<sup>4</sup> Lashkāri was one of the titles of Muḥammad Shāh; and is appended to his name in the heading of the chapter about his reign, in *Firishtah*. See note 1, page 93.

<sup>5</sup> The name is doubtful. It is written as **جیسنگہ رای والی قلعہ ببراکر** or **جیسک** in the MSS., and **حسکہ رای** in the lith. ed. *Firishtah* also gives him this name, but Col. Briggs (vol. II, page 489) calls him Ray Beejy Sing.

of diamonds had been found; 'Ādil Khān was sent with a body of *amīrs*, after a special robe of honour and a jewelled belt had been conferred on him. 'Ādil Khān in consultation with the other *amīrs* besieged the fort; and active and enterprising warriors advanced the batteries day after day, and made repeated assaults. In the end Jay Singh Rāy having no more strength left asked for an assurance of safety. 'Ādil Khān having drawn the pen of forgiveness across the page of his action, brought him out of the fort, and placing it in charge of his trusted adherents returned to the capital. Muḥammad Shāh Lashkarī <sup>1</sup> conferred that territory on him as his fief. <sup>2</sup> After

I cannot find any mention of the diamond mine in Firishtah; but he says that Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān received many honours and distinctions from Muḥammad Shāh; and was made the commander of the army of Daulatābād, and was appointed to conquer the fort of ویراکھرا, Wairākharā (Col. Briggs has Wyragur, and says in a note, probably Woshagur, lying between Antoor and Ajunta), which appears to me to be identical with Birākhar; and the recovery of the fort of انتور, Antūr, which had in the course of the troubles with Mālwa (the lith. ed. has فترات لودھیان, but probably the last word is a mistake for مالوہیان) come into the possession of a Marhatta. When Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān arrived at Daulatābād he nominated Qāsim Beg Ṣafaiikan to besiege Antūr; and sent Daryā Khān, whom he had given the name of brother (برادر خوانده خویش) to Wairākharā. The Hindū who held Antūr surrendered it without any contest; but the Rāja of Wairākharā whose name was Jainak Rāy (جینک رای), after fighting for five or six months, and finding himself unable to contend any longer, sent a message to Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān offering to surrender the fort with all he had in it, if he was allowed to go out with his family in safety. Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān agreed and sent an order accordingly to Daryā Khān, who allowed Jainak Rāy to leave the fort in safety. Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān then came there post haste, and took possession of the fort, and all the treasures in it, and conciliated the chief men of the country with assurances of his protection. He then marched to the fort of لانہی, Lānhī (Col. Briggs, vol. II, page 489, has Ranjny and says in a note, probably Ranjungam, the chief town of the district of the same name); and the *rāizāda* of the place also surrendered it. This is, however, not mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn.

<sup>1</sup> There is a difference in the readings. The MSS. have ان ولایت را باقطاع او مقرر کرده بود بر; but the lith. ed. has ان ولایت را کہ باقطاع او مقرر داشت قرار داشت.

<sup>2</sup> The meaning is not at all clear, and the readings are doubtful. It is not clear to whom and why Malik-ut-tujjār Khwājah Juhān spoke. The

a time Malik-ut-tujjār Khwājah Jahān said that Birkāna Rāy had placed his foot outside the path of allegiance, and having collected a very large army had advanced to the port of Goa. The Sultān advanced (against him), and besieged the fort of Birkāna. This fort was so strong that the idea of taking it had never entered the mind of any conqueror of forts. It was built from its foundation to its turrets with chiselled stone, and the breadth of each slab was three yards and its length was one yard, and the height of its wall was

readings in the MSS. are بعد از مدتی ملک التجار خواجه جهان گفت که رای برگشته قدم از جاده اطاعت بیرون نهاده لشکر عظیم بهم رسانیده متوجه بندر گروہ شد و قلعه . . . and بعد از مدت ملک التجار خواجه جهان گفت که رای برکنہ قدم از جاده اطاعت بیرون نهاده لشکر عظیم بهم رسانیده متوجه بندر گروہ شد سلطان متوجه شدہ قلعه برکنہ را محاصره کرد.

I do not think that either of the readings is strictly correct. I have adopted a reading which appears to me to be the best after comparing those in the MSS., and the reading in the lith. ed. Firishtah's version is that in 877 A.H., 1472 A.D., رای قلعه نلگاوان بتحرک حمرای فرمانده بیجانگر عازم تسخیر جزیرہ کردید. Col. Briggs says "In the year 877 A.H. Birkana Ray (he says in a note 'the Oriental Scholar will recognize in this penult the language of the southern part of the peninsula'; but not knowing the Dravidian languages, I cannot find out the meaning of this), Raja of the fortress of Belgam, at the instigation of the Ray of Bejjanuggur marched to retake the island of Goa." As regards Belgam, Col. Briggs says that it is now occupied by British troops, and is deemed one of the strongest on the plains in that part of the country. The name of the Rāy as given by Nizām-ud-dīn has some resemblance to that in Firishtah; but Nizām-ud-dīn does not give the name of the fort; though in one place he gives it, the same name as that of the Rāy. Mr. Sewell, on page 100 of "A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar," gives another translation of the part of Firishtah relating to this matter. In it the Rāy is called Parkna, and the fortress Bālgau, which is nearer the Persian than the name in the translation by Col. Briggs. Mr. Sewell goes on to say that "the Burhan-i-Maāsir calls the chief of Belgaum "Parkatapatah", and Major King, the translator of the work, gives a large variety of the spellings of the name, viz.: "Birkanah," "Parkatatabtah," "Parkatiyah," "Parkitah," "Barkabth" (Ind. Ant., Nov. 1899, page 286, note). Briggs gives it as Birkana. It has been supposed that the real name was "Vikrama". Mr. Sewell does not say from whom and on what authority the supposition emanated. It appears to me that the real name may be Pratāp, or some derivative from that word.



force; and had plundered and devastated portions of it; and had gone back to his own country. Muḥammad Shāh sent Malik Nizām-ul-mulk with a large army to chastise and punish the Rāy, but after some days intelligence arrived, that Nizām-ul-mulk had

had slain the ruler, who was a vicious tyrant, and who violated the honour and the property of his subjects; and made the fort over to **هميراوريا** (Hamīrā Oriṇ in the lith. ed.; Bheem Raj Oorea, according to Col. Briggs), who had been a *protégé* of Muḥammad Shāh. Hamīrā sent men to the Rāy of Orissa and incited him to invade the Dakin, and told him that there were no troops in that country on account of the famine, which had lasted for two years, and he would be easily able to conquer Tilang; and if he made it over to Hamīrā, the latter would surrender the fort of Kandnīr and its dependencies to him. The Rāy of Orissa was deceived, and with one thousand horsemen and six or seven thousand infantry, and taking the Rāja of Jājnagar with him, invaded Tilang. Nizām-ul-mulk Basrī, the governor of Rājamandrī, being unable to meet him, shut himself up in the fort; and sent a representation of the facts to the Sultān. The latter paid a year's wages to the soldiers, and started immediately. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the enemy, the latter did not think it advisable to fight; and Hamīrā shut himself up in the fort of Kandnīr. The Rāy of Orissa crossed the Rājamandrī river (*i.e.*, the Godāvarī), and encamped on the bank of the river on the side of his own territory. The Sultān arrived near the river, and Nizām-ul-mulk joined him. He could not, however, at once cross the river, and when he had got the boats, etc., the Rāy marched away and went back to his capital. The Sultān, however, was highly incensed at his conduct, and left Shāhẓāda Maḥmūd **Khān** and the **Khawājah Jahān** there; and himself advanced with twenty thousand horse to punish that *kāfir*. Towards the end of 882 A.H., he arrived at the capital of Orissa and plundered and ravaged the country. The Rāy had left the central part of his territory unprotected, and had fled to the extreme end of it; so the Sultān stayed in the capital for six months, and obtained much treasure and wealth both by peaceful means and by violence. He then wanted to summon the Shāhẓāda and the **Khawājah**, and to make the country over to them. The Rāy hearing this sent presents and elephants to him; and said that he would not again help the *zamīndārs* of Tilang. The Sultān demanded twenty-five other elephants, which had belonged to the Rāy's father, and were very valuable. The Rāy had to comply; and the Sultān then returned towards his own kingdom. On the way he besieged a fort belonging to the Rāy, because the people of the neighbourhood told him, that no one had ever before dared to attack it: but he raised the siege on the Rāy having apologized for the rudeness of those ignorant and boorish people. Then he besieged Kandnīr for five or six months when Hamīrā in great distress surrendered it to him.

fled from him, and had gone towards <sup>1</sup> Zīrbād. The spirit of the Sultān being now excited he marched out of the city, and advanced by successive marches in the direction of Rājmandrī; and <sup>2</sup> when he arrived near it, he left Khwājah Jahān in attendance on the Shāhzāda; and advanced himself with twenty thousand selected horsemen and marching rapidly went to Rājmandrī. When he arrived near it, he found a wide expanse of water, the breadth of which was about one *farsakh*, before him. Muḥammad Shāh was compelled to draw rein there. The Rāy of Orissa had encamped on the opposite bank of the river with seven *lakhs* of infantry and a number of elephants. When he found that Muḥammad Shāh Lashkarī had arrived there in person, he left Rāy Mān, who was one of his principal chiefs, in the fort of Rājmandrī, and fled. The following day the Sultān nominated Daryā Khān to pursue the Rāy of Orissa; and himself encamped around the fort of Rājmandrī. He built a second wall round the fort to stop the entrances and exits of the fort; and having distributed the batteries amongst his commanders, planned the erection of covered ways. After four months, when the covered ways had been completed, and the soldiers were able to overlook the garrison, Rāy Mān seeing his own death with the eye of certainty, asked for protection, in great humility and distress, and surrendered the fort, and sent an elephant, which he had in the fort, as tribute; and enlisted himself among the servants (of Muḥammad Shāh). The latter confirmed him in the possession of the fort and its neighbourhood, and returned to his capital. He raised the men who had performed great deeds in the expedition to high ranks and noble positions. It is however mentioned in the Ṭabaqāt Bahādurī, that the fort of Rājmandrī was not conquered; but the Rāy of Orissa paid tribute, and turned Muḥammad Shāh Lashkarī off from all thought of him.

And the intoxication and madness of warfare had not passed from the head of the Sultān, when news was brought that the men

<sup>1</sup> The name of the place is زېرباد in one MS., and زېرباد in the other and in the lith. ed.

<sup>2</sup> This agrees with Firishtah. See note 24, pp. 151 and 152. The wide expanse of water is apparently the Godāvāri.

of Orissa had come back, and had overrun some villages and *parganas*; and had taken the fort of <sup>1</sup>Bakīr by fraud and deceit. Muḥammad Shāh started from the vicinity of his capital, at the moment which was chosen by the astrologers, and by repeated marches proceeded to the country of Tilang. He besieged the fort of <sup>2</sup>Kandār, when the *thānadār* of the place after much distress and lamentation sought the Sultān's protection, and <sup>3</sup>surrendered the fort. The Sultān started from there to view the sea and proceeded to the <sup>4</sup>ports of Narsingh Rāy: and after amusing himself with a sight of the sea, he took tribute from Narsingh Rāy and started for the capital. He ordered the erection in those parts of a high and strong fort, in the course of one month, for the *thānadārs*. At the time of his return, in the year 879 A.H., the *vazīrs* told him, that there was a city on the border of Tilang, which was celebrated as <sup>5</sup>Kanjī, and which was full of gold and gems, and was one of the

<sup>1</sup> The name of the fort appears to be بکیر, Bakīr in the MSS. In the lith. ed., it is گیر Gīr. In the text-edition the name of the fort is not mentioned.

<sup>2</sup> The name is کندار Kandār in one MS., کند Kand in the other. کنده Kandah in the lith. ed., and گول کنده in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> There are some variations in the readings. I have adopted the reading which appeared to me to be the best.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah does not refer indefinitely to the ports of Narsingh Rāy; but mentions one of them, Machhlipatan, which he says belonged to the kingdom of Narsingh Rāy and which he says Muḥammad Shāh conquered. As for Narsingh Rāy, or Nara Simha, as he, taking the Sanskrit form of the name calls him, Mr. Sewell (p. 102) says that he "Owing to his numerous army and the extent of his dominions was the greatest and most powerful of all the rulers of Talingana and Vijayanagar" and "Had established himself in the midst of the country of Kanara and Talingana, and taken possession of most of the districts of the coasts and interior of Vijayanagar". Mr. Sewell's account appears to have been taken from the *Burhān-i-Ma'āthir*.

<sup>5</sup> This city is known in Sanskrit books as Kānchī or Kānchīpuram, and is now known as Conjeevaram. Firishtah's account of the way in which the existence of Kānjī came to the notice of the Sultān was that, when he arrived at Kondpūralli, some people of that place reported to him, that there was a temple, at a distance of ten days' journey from there, which was called Kānjī, and the doors and walls and roofs of which were adorned with gold and jewelled ornaments, and decorated with rubies and other fine gems, and not one of the Musalmān kings had up to that time set eyes on it, and had not even heard



great places of worship of the Hindūs ; and it was ten days' journey from <sup>1</sup>Nilwāra. Muḥammad Lashkarī selected one thousand men and started for Kanjī by forced marches. When he arrived there, there were only forty horsemen in attendance on him. The soldiers galloped into the city, and plundered and ravaged it. The Sulṭān stayed there for ten days ; and then returned to the capital.

In the year 886 A.H., <sup>2</sup>some interested persons, in Golkonda, said that the coming of the Rāy of Orissa into the Sulṭān's dominion

its name. Sulṭān Muḥammad detached six thousand horsemen adorned with daggers, and started on a rapid march to the place ; and ordered Shāhzāda Maḥmūd Khān to remain there ; and it appears from the concurrent testimony of all the historians, that the Sulṭān rode so fast that not more than forty horsemen could remain with him.

<sup>1</sup> The name is نِيلَوَارَة, Nilwāra, in both MSS. and تَيْكَوَارَة, Tikwāra, in the lith. ed. As will be seen from the preceding note, Kānjī was, according to Firishtah, ten days' journey from Kondpūrpallī, which Col. Briggs calls Condapilly. Firishtah's account of what happened at Kānjī is somewhat different. According to him there was some hand to hand encounters between the Sulṭān and the members of his guard, and some Hindūs of gigantic stature, who were the guardians of the temple. These went on till the Hindūs were compelled to retire into the temple ; and when the rest of the Sulṭān's escort arrived, the Sulṭān entered the temple, and looted it, and slew the men who were inside it. Mr. Sewell quoting from Firishtah says (p. 101) that "the Sulṭān went to Kondapalle (which he says in a note, Scott, I, p. 166, calls Ghondpore and Briggs, II, p. 500, Condapilly) ; and there was told that at a distance of ten days' journey was the temple of Kunchy, the walls and roof of which was plated with gold and ornamented with precious stones". In a note he says, "this evidently means Kānchi or Conjeeveram, but the story is exceedingly improbable. The distance was 250 miles, and the way lay through the heart of a hostile country". Further on quoting the Burhān-i-Ma'āthir, he says (p. 102) that "when Sulṭān Muḥammad was at Mālūr which belonged to Narasimha, who was the greatest and most powerful of the rulers of Talingana and Vijayanagar, he was informed that at a distance of fifty *farsakhs* from his camp was a city called Gangi, containing temples, etc., to which he promptly marched, arriving before the place on the 13th March, A.D. 1481 (11th Muḥarram, A.H. 886). He sacked the city and returned".

<sup>2</sup> According to Firishtah, Malik-ut-tujjār Khwājah Jahān introduced various reforms, as regards the subdivision of the country, and the government of the forts, and the payment of the troops. They were all excellent, but they caused much discontent. The minister knew it, but he disregarded it, having great confidence in himself and his friends. The chief among the latter was Yūsuf

was at the summons and incitement of Malik-ut-tujjār Khwājah Jahān. In support of their statement, they produced a letter, which bore the seal of the Khwājah, (and which they said) he had written to the Rāy of Orissa. As a matter of fact, they had given a piece of gold to the seal-bearer of the Khwājah Jahān, and had got his seal impressed on a piece of white (blank) paper. They wrote the matter on that paper, and brought it under the eye (of the Sultān). When someone went to summon the Khwājah : although his slaves told him, that as on account of his wealth, there were ten thousand horses in his stable, and there were ten thousand Turkī slaves in attendance on him, it was right and proper that he should go away to Gujrāt, the Khwājah said " I have committed no offence, why should I run away ? I have every hope that the right should be separated from the wrong, and the truth from falsehood ". As the hand of death brought the simple-minded Khwājah, by the nape of the neck to attend on Muhammad Lashkarī, that letter was shown to him : and without any enquiry being made in the matter, he was put to death on the

3rd of Šafar of that year. He lived nobly and died a martyr ; may the mercy of God be on him ! *Khawājah Jahān Khawājah Maḥmūd Gīlānī* was among the most learned men of the age, and was distinguished for great perfection in literary work. He wrote an elegant book on letter-writing, and included in it the letters which he had written to the great and noble men ; and named it the <sup>1</sup> *Riyāḍ-ul-inshā*. He also sent presents and gifts to the men of his age in *Khurāsān* and 'Irāq and 'Arab and 'Ajam ; more specially he sent letters to His Holiness Maulānā 'Abd-ur-Rahmān Jāmī, may his tomb be sanctified ; and gave expression to his veneration and respect for him. His Holiness the saint also believing in his sincerity and faith in himself sent him epistles which are extant in his correspondence. Among the *qaṣīdas* in his collected poems, there is a *qaṣīda*, which he specially composed in the name of the *Khawājah*. The opening couplet of it is :

<sup>2</sup> Couplet :

Welcome ! oh messenger of the land of the heart, welcome !  
Welcome, for I have devoted my life and heart to thee  
welcome !

He has also said in it :

Couplet :

To the world he is *Khawājah*, to *faqr* (poverty with contentment) he is the preface  
There is the secret of *faqr*, but under the veils of wealth ;  
and in a *ghazl* (ode) he has said :  
Jāmī ! thy heart-stirring verse is an article fine ;

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah calls the book, the *Rauḍat-ul-inshā*.

<sup>2</sup> These and the following lines are all quoted by Firishtah also ; but in the second line of the first couplet نزل is substituted for بدل. نزل means a present placed before a guest when he first comes, and may be correct. At the end of the first line of the second couplet the words اوست are added ; and in the beginning of the second line ایت, sign or mark, is substituted for قلت. In the lines from the *ghazl*, which is called a *qī'ah* by Firishtah, the second line is بودش از حسن و لطف معانی نارش ; and in the fourth line عز is substituted for مهر.

Of that article, the charm is from the sweetness of the spirit :

Send it with the caravan to India, that it may receive  
The honour of the seal of acceptance of Malik-ut-tujjūr.

In short the execution of that victim the Khwājah was not auspicious for Muhammad Lashkari. After a few days he became ill, and although his physician, Sharf-i-Jahān, attended on and treated him, it was of no avail; and on the first day of Rabi'ul-Jawwal he passed away. The period of his reign was nineteen years four months and fifteen days.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SHIHĀB-UD-DIN MAHMŪD SHĀH, SON OF MUHAMMAD SHĀH LASHKARI.

Sultān Shihāb-ud-din Mahmūd Shāh, who was the rightful son of Sultān Muhammad Lashkari, ascended and sat on the throne

of sovereignty and rule, after the death of his father. They say that in the keenness of his intellect, and the nobility of his spirit, and in other perfection, he was distinguished among the Bahmanī Sultāns. When his government attained to stability, the duties of the post of *vazīr* were allotted to <sup>1</sup>Malik Qiyām-ul-mulk Turk, and Malik

and about twenty days anterior to that mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn; while the English date differs from that given by Col. Briggs, by only three days.

<sup>1</sup> He is called ملک قوام الملك by Firishthah. The latter describes the coronation ceremony in some detail. It is rather difficult to unravel the plots and intrigues which took place immediately afterwards. According to Nizām-ud-dīn, Nizām-ul-mulk was the villain of the piece, and Qiyām-ul-mulk a simple-minded man, who was easily duped by him. Firishthah's account is not so simple. It appears that there was considerable hy-play between Yūsuf 'Adil Khān on the one hand and Nizām-ul-mulk on the other. Then it was settled that Nizām-ul-mulk would become the *Vakil-us-saltanat*, and his other appointments should be made over to other nobles; and for a time there was peace and amity. But after two or three months Nizām-ul-mulk and Qiyām-ul-mulk broke the engagement which they had entered into, and intended to remove Yūsuf 'Adil Khān from Bijāpūr, and place 'Adil Khān Dakinī, who was the deputy governor of Warangal there. They then summoned 'Adil Khān Dakinī and Fath-ul-lah 'Imād-ul-mulk to the capital on the pretext of their coming to congratulate the Sultān; and they came with their troops, and encamped outside the city. Two or three weeks after this, Nizām-ul-mulk told the simple-minded Qiyām-ul-mulk that he would that day send for the Dakinī troops, and he would remove (از میان برداریم) Yūsuf 'Adil Khān; and they would then be freed from all apprehension from him; and they would send away all his partisans to their respective *thūnas*. He also represented to Qiyām-ul-mulk that the Dakinī *amīrs* were afraid to come out of their houses (نمی توانند بدر خانه آمد) the meaning of which is not clear. It may mean what I have said in the text, or it may mean that they could not come to the palace), for fear of the Turkī *amīrs*. If he considered it desirable, an order should be issued, that the Turkī *amīrs* should not come out of their houses that day. Qiyām-ul-mulk accepted this suggestion. The next day the young Sultān was placed on a bastion of the citadel; and a message was sent to Yūsuf 'Adil Khān and Fath-ul-lah 'Imād-ul-mulk Dakinī that they should parade their troops in front of him; and should then receive permission to go away to their fiefs. Fath-ul-mulk, *kotwāl*, getting information of this, intimated to Qiyām-ul-mulk that Nizām-ul-mulk had traitorous designs against him and all the Turkī *amīrs*; and was merely making the destruction of Yūsuf 'Adil Khān a pretext; and it would be foolish for them to sit inert and negligent in their houses. Qiyām-ul-mulk had enmity towards 'Adil Khān, and had perfect faith in the

Nizām-ul-mulk ; but as the Turkī *amīrs* were many in number, their party was the stronger of the two. Owing to this, the fiery furnace of the envy of Nizām-ul-mulk and all the Indian nobles was inflamed. At last by the exertions of the great and the noble, they entered into agreements with one another, and confirmed them with strong oaths. But the perfidious Nizām-ul-mulk, taking the thread of flattery in his hand, and having made the simple-minded Qiyām-ul-mulk careless and negligent, stated one day, that ‘Ādil Khān and Daryā Khān and Mallī Khān and certain others wanted that they should, after receiving permission, go back to their respective *thānas* or posts. They were, however, owing to a fear which they had in their hearts, in respect of the Turkī *amīrs*, unable to come out of their houses. It would be advisable that on the day they should receive permission to leave, the Turkī *amīrs* should remain in their houses. Malik Qiyām-ul-mulk agreed to this proposal ; and on the following day

---

friendship of Nizām-ul-mulk ; and as his destruction was at hand, did not attend to the *kotwāl*'s warning. ‘Ādil Khān Dakinī and Fath-ul-lah ‘Imād-ul-mulk then came into the city with their respective troops from Tilang and Kāwīl ; and were honoured by being allowed to salute the Sultān. The latter, who was a puppet in the hands of Nizām-ul-mulk's party, sent for the chiefs of the two troops to the top of the bastion and told them that the Turkī slaves were committing excesses, and should be punished. Fath-ul-lah ‘Imād-ul-mulk, who was on terms of sincere attachment to Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān guarded him in the *mel’ce* ; and ‘Ādil Khān Dakinī and his troops were ordered to massacre the Turks. Qiyām-ul-mulk was first murdered and Farhād-ul-mulk the *kotwāl* was put into prison ; and other Turks were killed. Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān and his followers fought their way to the city gate, and brought in Daryā Khān, who had twenty-two thousand troops according to one statement, and ten thousand according to another ; and there were skirmishes in the city for twenty days between the two parties : till the learned and wise men intervened, and proposals were made for peace. Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān with his adherents went away to Bijāpūr.

It will be seen from the above, the Qiyām-ul-mulk or Qiyām-ul-mulk was not so simple-minded as Nizām-ul-dīn makes him out to be. Firishtah also calls him simple-minded ( ساده لوح ) in one place ; but it appears that he had treacherous designs against Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān. Firishtah goes on to say, that after peace had been established, the whole power rested with Nizām-ul-mulk for a period of four years, during which time, he and ‘Imād-ul-mulk acted in concert with the queen-mother. Firishtah also gives the names of the nobles on whom *jāgīrs* and offices were conferred.

Daryā Khān and 'Ādil Khān and all the Khāns, having made all preparations, entered the fort with their troops. Farhād-ul-mulk Turk, the *kotwāl*, sent information to Malik Qiyām-ul-mulk, that the *amīrs* had come with treacherous designs; but as the latter was doomed to die, he did not listen to it. The traitorous *amīrs* first seized Farhād-ul-mulk the *kotwāl*, and then put Qiyām-ul-mulk to death. After that they shut up the Turkī *amīrs* in their houses; and brought them out one by one, and murdered them. After Qiyām-ul-mulk Turk had been killed Nizām-ul-mulk and Malik 'Imād-ul-mulk took up the duties of the post of the *razir*, and attended to all affairs in concert with Malka-i-Jahān, the mother of Sultān Maḥmūd. The duties of the *kotwāl* of the capital were entrusted to Malik Barīd, who was a Turkī slave of Sultān Maḥmūd.

<sup>1</sup> When some time had passed in this way, one day Dilāwar Khān Ḥabshī submitted privately to Maḥmūd Shāh that Malik Nizām-ul-mulk and 'Imād-ul-mulk still considered the Sultān to be too young; and settled all matters themselves. He then obtained the permission of the Sultān to assassinate both the ministers; and waited for an opportunity. It so happened that the two *razirs* went one night to wait on the Malka-i-Jahān for the arrangement of certain matters connected with the government. When they were coming out, Dilāwar Khān with another man attacked them with swords at the gate of the palace. Nizām-ul-mulk was wounded; but as both had great skill in swordsmanship they came out of the

---

<sup>1</sup> The account of the attempt of Dilāwar Khān on the lives of Nizām-ul-mulk and 'Imād-ul-mulk as given by Firishtah is very similar to that in the text. But Firishtah says that Dilāwar Khān was envious of the ministers' power. Firishtah does not say where Nizām-ul-mulk and 'Imād-ul-mulk went. He only says that they went out of the city; and they informed Malik Barīd, that the Sultān had designs against his life; and Malik Barīd shut up the gates of the citadel, so that no one could get any access to the Sultān. The latter in great distress repented of the orders he had passed; and sent men to apologize to the ministers, and to ask them to return. They refused to do so, unless the Sultān ordered the execution of Dilāwar Khān. The latter on hearing this fled to the country of Asīr and Burhānpūr (i.e., Khāndesh). After that Nizām-ul-mulk and his son Malik Aḥmad came back to the city; but Faṭḥ-ul-lah 'Imād-ul-mulk went away to Berār. These events have not been mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn.

*mohr* with the strength of their arms. They sent for Malik Barīd the same night (and informed him); that Dīlāwar Khān wanted also to murder him. Early the next morning, both the *razīs* came out (of their houses), and made alien to each other; and Malik Nizām-ul-mulk started for Junir and ‘Imād-ul-mulk for Kūwil, which were their fiefs and remained there. On hearing this news the *andis* became dispersed; and great irregularity and weakness crept into the Sultān's affairs; and gradually Malik Barīd kept him as if in imprisonment. His, *i.e.*, the Sultān's, power was weakened and the men of the city made an attack on him. On the <sup>1</sup>night



of the 21st *Dhīqa'dah* in the year 892 A.H., a body of the ingrateful wretches, having united all the people in the fort, including the elephant-keepers and the <sup>1</sup>chamberlains or ushers, and the guards or sentries and the men in charge of the furniture (*parda-dārān*) with themselves, treacherously attacked their own sovereign prince. They did not know that :

Couplet :

Those whom God's protection doth guard,  
No danger comes from the revolution of the skies !

At that time Maḥmūd Shāh had spread the bed of pleasure when a great tumult arose in the fort. All the men taking up their arms hastened towards the palace. The elephant-keepers started after equipping their mounts, and they made the men in charge of the furniture their confederates. 'Aziz Khān Turk and Ḥasan 'Alī Khān and Saiyid Mirzā-i-Mashhadī who had the title of Mallū Khān came into the field of conflict, and made themselves his shields. From amongst them, a brave young man of the name of 'Aziz Khān, who was distinguished for his great bravery and courage, offered to sacrifice his dear life, with four other Turks for the Sultān's safety. The latter taking advantage of this opportunity took shelter on the roof of the *Shāhburj* (bastion). The seraglio and the *Shāhburj* and the whole of the fort fell into the hands of the rebels, who fastened all the doors, so that the loyal and faithful adherents could not enter the fort. Some of the soldiers, however, climbed to the top of the *Shāhburj* from the surrounding moat by means of ropes ; and drove away the rebels from its <sup>2</sup>neighbourhood, wounding them with their life-destroying arrows. <sup>3</sup> Some men set fire to things, and

---

<sup>1</sup> The word is باجیان in one MS., and in the lith. ed. and ناحبان in the other MS. The word in the corresponding passage of *Firishtah* is حاجبان chamberlains or ushers. The next word in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. is کوتوال, but in *Firishtah* it is کوتوالان. I have adopted حاجبان, and کوتوالان.

<sup>2</sup> The word is حویلی in the MSS., though in one of them there is what looks like a dot near the top of the ح so that the word looks like خویلی. In the lith. ed. the word is حویلی or a house, and حول neighbourhood. I think the reading in the lith. ed. is correct.

<sup>3</sup> This is explained by *Firishtah*, who says that the sweepers and *farrūshes* (men in charge of carpets, etc.) and other menial servants (Col. Briggs groups

the elephants fled in panic out of the fort. When the tumult and the disturbance ceased in the fort (he, i.e., I suppose, the Sultān), gave order that 'Jahāngīr Khān, who was Malik Nizām-ul-mulk, should guard the gate : and Khān Jahān, leaving the fort, should guard the city and the bazar, with his own men. When half the night was over, and the moon rose, troops came from all sides, and gathered together in the courtyard of the *Shāhburj*. He then ordered that the Arabian horses, which were bred in the royal stables, should be distributed among the men, and they, mounted on them, should completely destroy those men of evil destiny. When the auspicious morning dawned, some of the latter threw themselves into the moat, and broke their necks : and some became food for the sword. Some concealed themselves in the rat-holes ? (موش خانا), but after two or three days they were dragged out and got the meed of their deeds.

<sup>2</sup> It is written in history that one day a messenger came from 'Adil Khān, and submitted a representation from him to the effect, that the *amīrs* of that *ṣūba* had, at the instigation of Dastūr-ul-mulk, raised the standard of disturbance and rebellion : and that that slave (i.e., he himself) relying on the grandeur of the good fortune of His Majesty, had with the help of Fakhr-ul-mulk dispersed them.

---

them all as the servants of the palace) who had first joined the enemy, and had got them into the fort, at this time showed their loyalty and devotion and set fire to some fodder. Col. Briggs says they set fire to the straw roofs under which numbers were concealed.

<sup>1</sup> This man is called Sultān Jahāngīr Khān Turk who had the title of Malik-ul-ma'at, in the lith. ed. of *Firishlah* ; and it is said there that he was ordered to guard the gate of the fort. Col. Briggs calls him Sooltan Jehangeer Khan Toork. He says nothing about his having any title ; and says, "now took charge of the palace gates" (vol. II, page 531).

<sup>2</sup> I cannot find any reference to this in *Firishlah* ; but probably what is narrated below refers to the same events, but the account is brief, and the names do not agree. I am quoting from Col. Briggs, (vol. II, page 529). "In the year 891, Adil Khan Deceany, governor of Wurungole died, when Kowam-ool-Moolk, junior, came by forced marches from Rajmundry to that city, and established himself in Talingana. Nizam-ool-Moolk, accompanied by the King marched towards Wurungole ; on which Kowam-ool-Moolk, falling back on Rajmundry, wrote secretly to the King, warning him against the minister."

It was however, now, reported again that they had collected together ; and 'Aziz-ul-mulk had joined them.

Couplet :

They have nothing in their heads except rebellious thoughts,  
There is no remedy, except marching against them for war.

Immediately on receiving this intelligence, the Sultān ordered the *amīrs* who were on his side that they should march in concert for the punishment of that body of evil destiny ; and he himself with one thousand Turkī slaves (guards) marched on the wings of speed. At each stage of the journey, the *amīrs* came and joined them. When they arrived in the vicinity of Rājmundrī, he on the next day made over the arrangement of the right and left wing to Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk ; and marched to the field of battle ; and the evil starred rebels also advanced to meet them ; and arrayed their ranks. 'Ādil Khān, who was the commander of the right wing, fought bravely, and defeated the rebels. Dastūr-ul-mulk who was the head and leader of the rebels was seized ; and the warriors pursued the enemy and cast most of those wretches on the dust of destruction. Some of the men, however, carried half a life away with great difficulty. When Maḥmūd Shāh came back to the camp, from the battle-field, with victory and triumph, he at the request of 'Ādil Khān pardoned the guilt and offence of Dastūr-ul-mulk, who had absurd thoughts in his head ; and giving him back all his property, which had been escheated to the government, confirmed him in the rank, which he had formerly held. Then he arranged all the affairs of state with the advice and concurrence of the *amīrs*, and returned to Gulbarga.

After some days news came that a body of the men, who had fled, had shut themselves up in the fort of Sunkar. Maḥmūd Shāh, in concert with the loyal *amīrs*, proceeded by successive marches, and besieged the fort ; and enterprising warriors at the first onset captured the lower fort (حصار اول). The garrison then betook themselves to the upper citadel ; and when they saw that they had not the strength to make further resistance they prayed for safety and surrendered the fort. Maḥmūd Shāh left one of his trusted men in the fort, and returned to the city of Bīdar. According to the custom of former Sultāns, he made the different ranks of the great and noble men fortunate by the granting of rewards.

In the year 896 A.H., <sup>1</sup>Bahādur Gilānī, who was one of the servants of Khwājah Maḥmūd Khwājah Jahān, and was also in charge of the *thāna*, had raised the dust of rebellion, and had taken forcible possession of certain *parganas*, and also of the port of Dābul. He had equipped some ships, and had stretched hands of oppression and tyranny over the ports of Gujrāt, so that the passage over the sea was closed. It so happened also that some ships belonging to Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrātī had fallen into his hands; and he had plundered everything that was contained in them; and had cast Sultān Maḥmūd's men into prison. Another version of the incident is that as merchants and the servants مترددین of merchants complained of Bahādur Gilānī's acts, Sultān Maḥmūd sent Kamāl Khān and Ṣafdar Khān with some troops, some of whom were to go by water and some to march by land (with order), that they should cast the boat of his (*i.e.*, Bahādur's) life in the whirlpool of destruction. As Kamāl Khān and Ṣafdar Khān went on horses that travelled on the wind (*i.e.*, ships), the bridle of (their) power fell into the wind (*i.e.*, I suppose they were caught in a storm); and contrary winds carried their ships to a great distance from one another. Bahādur sent a man to express his allegiance. When Kamāl Khān and Ṣafdar Khān came and joined him with a small body of men, he at once meditated treachery towards them; and there was a great battle. So much blood and water got mixed together that the water took the colour of a bright ruby. In the end Kamāl Khān and Ṣafdar Khān received wounds and fell into Bahādur's hands; and he sent them to Dābul.

When this news reached Sultān Maḥmūd, he appointed Qiwām-ul-mulk with fifty thousand horsemen to attack Bahādur. When

---

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah gives the following account of the antecedents of Bahādur Gilānī; he was a servant of Malik-ut-tujjār Khwājah Maḥmūd Gilānī. After the latter's martyrdom, he became a servant of Najm-ud-dīn Gilānī; and when the latter was in charge of the port of Goa, he became the *kotwāl* of that town, and became known for his bravery and courage. When Najm-ud-dīn died, the thought of hostility (مخالفت), or more correctly rebellion, entered his mind; and in the year 889, he took possession of Goa and the entire fief of Kishwar Khān; and in a short time he seized Dābul and Chaul and Kalhar and Panāla and Kolāpūr and Sarvāla and Nīlgawān and Mirich.

Qiwām-ul-mulk arrived at Mahīm, he made enquiries about the different roads. It was at last found out that it would be difficult to reach their destination unless they marched over a part of the <sup>1</sup>Deccan. So after attacking certain villages, he came alone to the court, marching with great rapidity, so that he might represent the true state of things, and obtain permission to trespass into the Dakin kingdom.

Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh Gujrātī, owing to his innate kindness, sent a letter to Maḥmūd Shāh (Bahmanī), to the purport that it was a life-time, since the chain of friendship and attachment between the two parties had been strengthened; and this noble alliance between them had come to them in the form of an inheritance and from this side (*i.e.*, from himself) there had been no default in the discharge of the rights of friendship. "When," he went on to say, "Sultān Maḥmūd Khiljī had seized the Deccan from the late Sultān Nizām Shāh, if I had not helped the latter with my army he would have lost his kingdom. At this time, it has come to my knowledge that Bahādur Gilānī, the governor of the port of Dābul, had plundered twenty vessels belonging to my government and to merchants which were filled with valuables and pearls and various rich stuffs, and had sent two hundred ships to Mahīm, and had invaded and ravaged that country, and had burnt down mosques and other places of worship. As I had and have regard for our old friendship, it appears, under the orders of the judge of wisdom, that I should bring the circumstances to your knowledge. If the light of sovereignty (*i.e.*,

---

<sup>1</sup> The meaning is not at all clear. If Qiwām-ul-mulk was sent by Sultān Maḥmūd Bahmanī, as the context would indicate, there would be no objection to his marching over a part of the Deccan, which was in the Bahmanī kingdom. In Firishatī's account, it appears that Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrātī wrote to Sultān Maḥmūd Bahmanī complaining of the depredations committed by Bahādur Gilānī, and pointed out, that the army of Gujrāt could not march to attack him by the land route, unless a part of the Dakin kingdom was laid waste and trampled under foot (and ruined) by his soldiers. It would appear that Nizām-ud-dīn has mixed up things a little. In fact, it appears from Firishatī that Kamāl Khān and Šafdar Khān came with a brave army by sea, under the orders of the Sultān of Gujrāt; and that Bahādur had fought with them and seized them and kept them in imprisonment. This is, however, not mentioned in Col. Briggs's translation.

you yourself) should not advance to crush him, I would give him such punishment, that it would be a warning to him." Maḥmūd Shāh gave assurances to the ambassador, and summoned the *amīrs* who were in agreement with him; and told them that "The return of the rights of benefits is incumbent on all, and more specially on Sultāns. Besides, Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrātī is a sovereign possessing much power; and it is conceivable that injury may be caused by him to this country; and as discourteous and wrongful acts have been committed by Bahādur Gilānī, it is right and proper that the *amīrs* should collect their armies, and turn their attention to his discomfiture and destruction." Then according to the advice of the *amīrs* a *farmān* was sent to Bahādur; and he was informed of the purport of Sultān Maḥmūd's letter. He was also directed to send to the court all that he had taken from the ships and to send the ships also by way of the sea; and also to send Kamāl Khān and Šafdar Khān and every one connected with them to his presence. He was also informed of the purport of these couplets:

Couplets :

Why dost not thou to thy own good attend ?  
 Make not the face of thy fortune black.  
 Place not thy foot outside the measure right,  
 For thou wilt headlong fall into the well of danger dire.

When Bahādur heard that a servant of Maḥmūd Shāh was bringing the *farmān*, he wrote to his guards of the road, that they should not let him pass beyond the fort of Mirich. He loosened his audacious tongue to give expression to boasting and bragging, and wrote an improper reply, and forwarded it. When (the news of) the temerity and audacity of Bahādur, and of his preposterous reply reached Maḥmūd Shāh,<sup>1</sup> he, with the advice and concurrence

---

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah's account of the expedition agrees mainly with that in the text; but he says in addition that Yūsuf 'Adil Khān sent five thousand horsemen under his *Sar Naubat* (*Sar* or rather *Meer Nobut*, according to Briggs, p. 527, means Commander of the bodyguard) Kamāl Khān Dakinī; and Malik Aḥmad Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri, the same number under Mubārīz Khān (Col. Briggs calls him Moetibar Khan); son of Khwājah Jahān Turk, and Faṭḥ-ul-lah 'Imād-ul-mulk also sent a small body of horsemen under one of his trusted servants. to reinforce him, Bahādur Gilānī had had fights with the first two, and

of the *amīrs*, advanced against him by successive marches : and after traversing many stages arrived in front of the <sup>1</sup> fort, which Bahādur had been engaged for a long time in strengthening : and in which he had collected an immense number of cavalry and infantry. The garrison on seeing the number and grandeur of the Sultān's army, turned their ill-starred faces towards flight. The Sultān remained there for three days, in order to arrange the affairs of the place : and then advanced towards <sup>2</sup> Bōrkāl, where Bahādur had fortified himself. Before, however, the (royal) troops arrived there, Bahādur abandoned the fort and fled. The Rāy or *zamīndār* of the place came to attend on the Sultān, and enlisted himself among his loyal adherents. When Bahādur fled from Bōrkāl, the commander of his army took up his position in the fort of Mirich. The *amīrs* then decided on the capture of Mirich, and taking Maḥmūd Shāh with them, they advanced against it. When they arrived there (they found), that the governor of the neighbourhood had come to the help of Bahādur's men, and had strengthened the fort. They came forward to meet, and fight with, the invading army. The latter surrounded the fort from all sides, and attacked Bahādur's men. When most of those who had sallied out of the fort with the desire of fighting were mixed with the dust of destruction ; and the

---

they had not been able to defeat him : and they therefore considered it fortunate that the Sultān should undertake his chastisement. When they arrived at the fort of Jāmkhāndī (which, it appears, Bahādur had by his good policy, (حسن تدبیر) wrested from the possession of Yūsuf 'Adil Khān), Quṭb-ul-mulk Dakīnī, who was the *juzgūr* of Tilang, was ordered to attack it : but he was killed by an arrow shot from the fort. The Sultān conferred the title of Quṭb-ul-mulk on Sultān Qulī Khawāṣṣ Hamadānī with certain territories in Talingāna as his *jūgūr*. This man later became the founder of the Quṭb Shāhī dynasty. When Jāmkhāndī was taken, it was made over to the servants of Yūsuf 'Adil Khān. The Sultān then marched towards Manklir (in the lith. ed.—Mangalore (?), but Col. Briggs has Sunkeswar) where Bahādur had taken up his residence. Before, however, the Sultān's troops arrived there, Bahādur fled from that place. It was taken in the course of three days, after which the Sultān marched towards Mirich. The garrison came out and gave battle : but most of them were slain, and the survivors retired into the fort.

<sup>1</sup> The name of the fort is not given in the text, but probably Jāmkhāndī is referred to. See the preceding note.

<sup>2</sup> Bōrkāl does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah.

governor of that country, who was the head and leader of the rebels, was killed; the remainder fled, and like snakes got into holes. Maḥmūd Shāh and the *amīrs* considered it advisable that they should distribute the batteries (among the leaders of the army), and dig mines on various sides of the fort, so that the water in the fort might flow into the moat, and the garrison might be in great straits for want of water. It was also decided that opposite to each bastion, a bastion should be erected outside the fort.

When the commandant of the fort saw that the path of flight was closed, he came in great humility, and prayed for quarter Maḥmūd Shāh, with the consent of the *amīrs*, gave him promise of protection; and notified to the soldiers of Bahādur, that to such of them as might wish to enter his service, the men in charge of his treasury would give subsistence allowance and *jāgīrs*: and as regards such of them as might wish to go to Bahādur the guards of the roads would not prevent them taking away with them their horses and equipment. After his mind had been set at rest about the fort of Mirieh, the Sultān turned his attention towards the forts of Kalhar and Dābul. When he arrived at the village or place called <sup>1</sup> Mālwa a son was born to him on the 27th Rajab in the year 899 A.H. In gratitude for this great gift, he opened his hand for giving benefactions and largesses: and placing the crown of Aḥmad Shāh on the head of that light of his eyes, gave him the name of Aḥmad Shāh.

When Bahādur heard of the conquest of the fort of Mirieh, and of the advance of the Sultān towards Kalhar and Dābul, he fell into the chasm of amazement and the gulf of bewilderment. He knew that with meagre plannings, he had attempted a great feat. On whatever side he looked, he found the door of flight closed. Then in distress and humility he sent Khwājah Na'amat-ul-lah Tabrizī to wait on the *amīrs*; and to ask for pardon of his offences. Sultān

---

<sup>1</sup> The name is Mālwa in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah the name cannot be made out; the sentence being از مرچ کوچیده پیاده رفت where the word پیاده appears to be a mistake for the name of the place, but it will be seen from note 2, p.122, Firishtah has Piāda as the name for a place, Col. Briggs (vol. II, page 541) calls the place Walwa. The birth of the son is mentioned in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but I cannot find any reference to it in Col. Briggs's History.



Maḥmūd Shāh, in accordance with the prayers of the *amīrs*, drew the pen of forgiveness across the offences of Bahādur Gilānī, and pardoned all his faults. He ordered that if Bahādur would hasten to render homage to him, and would send two elephants, and the tribute, which had been fixed, to the treasury, the forts and towns, which have been taken out of his possession, would again be restored to him. Khwājah Naʿmat-ul-Jah wrote to Bahādur that his prayers had been accepted, and he should come with all haste. When the Khwājah's letter reached Bahādur, <sup>1</sup> the erow of pride again laid the egg of conceit and exultation in his head. He cast down the honour which he would have acquired by his (forth-coming) engagements and promises into the dust of wretchedness. The *amīrs*, taking Maḥmūd Shāh with them, advanced in the direction of the fort of <sup>2</sup> Jākīr. When they arrived on the bank of the river of Kalhar, they distributed the batteries (among themselves), and besieged the fort. When the morning raised the veil of darkness from the cheek of the sky, the whole army at once galloped into the battle-field, and whoever came out of the fort to give them battle, became at once food for their swords. When the greatness and grandeur of Maḥmūd Shāh's army were impressed on the minds of the enemy, and night came on, they gave up all idea of fighting, and took to flight; and owing to their evil destiny <sup>3</sup> the town of Kalhar was sacked.

On hearing this news, Malik Shams-ud-dīn Tārmī, *thānadār* of Mustafābād, came with the residents of that city to see the Sultān. The latter after waiting for two or three days in the town of Kalhar, and arranging the affairs of that territory, advanced towards <sup>4</sup> Kālāpūr

<sup>1</sup> This agrees generally with Firishtah; but he adds that Bahādur boasted that he would have the *Khutba* (public prayers) read in his own name, that same year, in Ahmadābād Bīdar, and the next year in Ahmadābād Gnjrat. Col. Briggs (vol. II, page 511) says that Bahādur "made an attack on the King's baggage", but I cannot find any mention of this in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

<sup>2</sup> The name is جاکیر Jākīr in the MSS. and جایگیر Jāyگیر in the lith. ed. Firishtah does not mention the place, but says that the Sultān on hearing Bahādur's bragging, came from Piyaḍa to Kalhar.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah also says the town was sacked, but Col. Briggs does not mention the fact.

<sup>4</sup> The town is called Kālāpūr in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and Kālānūr in the other MS.; but evidently both names are incorrect; the correct name is Kolāpūr, and is used later on.

When he arrived in the village of <sup>1</sup>Sulāla, news was brought that Bahādur having come out of the fort of <sup>2</sup>Panāla had marched towards Kolāpūr; and had with a mistaken idea got a body of men to join him, and was preparing for strife and bloodshed. After receiving this news, when (the Sultān) by successive marches arrived in the vicinity of Kolāpūr, most of Bahādur's troops separated from him, and joined the service of Maḥmūd Shāh. Bahādur then fled, and betook himself to a corner. Maḥmūd Shāh, with the advice of the *amirs*, sent Malik <sup>3</sup>Fakhr-ul-mulk and 'Ain-ul-mulk to take charge of the fort of Panāla and its neighbourhood; and decided that he would spend the rainy season in Kolāpūr, till the bushes of the enmity and tree of the rebellion of Bahādur should be totally uprooted. When Bahādur received information of this, his eye of hope became blind, and he fell from the zenith of pride down to the nadir of humility. He then again sent a petition by the hand of Khwājah Na'mat-ullāh Tabrizī, and prayed that an 'agreement

<sup>1</sup> Apparently not mentioned by Firshih.

<sup>2</sup> It was according to Firshih the strongest fort in that part of the country, and Bahādur had taken shelter in it, when he was frightened on hearing the news of the capture of the forts of Murīh and Kallur. He now came out, because the Sultān did not at once proceed to besiege it; but went to view the sea, and the port of Dābul. Firshih says that when Maḥmūd Shāh went to see the sea and the port of Dābul, Bahādur came rapidly to Kolāpūr with the intention of blocking the road and giving battle; but when he saw the pomp and grandeur of Maḥmūd Shāh's army, he again became frightened and fled. Bahādur's belief that the Sultān was too weak to engage him is apparently refuted to by Nizām-ud-dīn by the use of the words *بتصور باطل*.

<sup>3</sup> Firshih calls him *نوردد حاکم جهان*, in the title ed., but Col. Briggs calls him Khwājah Jahan, governor of the fort of Panāla. Firshih also joined *نوردد حاکم جهان* with Fakhr-ul-mulk and 'Ain-ul-mulk, but Col. Briggs does not mention either 'Ain-ul-mulk or Mam' Khān.

<sup>4</sup> Firshih says that the *qadaṣṣa* was to bear the sacred seal (*مهر اقدس*) i.e., of the Sultān) and also the seals of Malik Qāsim Barīd Turk, and other chief men. It may be mentioned that throughout the narrative of the expedition against Bahādur Gilāni, and in fact of the whole reign, both in the accounts of Nizām-ud-dīn and Firshih, there are indications of Maḥmūd Shāh being a puppet in the hands of Qāsim Barīd and other nobles. There are attempts made to show that he had great power and grandeur, but it appears also that he could do nothing without the concurrence of Qāsim Barīd and his associates.



their precepts. When they returned <sup>1</sup>Makhdūm A'zam, Ṣadr Jahān and Qāḍī Zain-ud-dīn Ḥasan also went, and did not refrain from giving him advice. But as he had fallen a hundred *farsakhs* away from the path of truth, good fortune did not come to his aid; and wishing only to waste time, he said that if Maḥmūd Shāh should march towards the fort of Mirich, this slave (that is he himself) would come there and render him homage.

<sup>2</sup>After the *razīs* had returned, the Sultān summoned Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk from the fort of Panāla, and having, with the consent of the *amīrs* conferred on him a special robe of honour and a jewelled belt, sent him to effect the destruction of Bahādur. Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk proceeded by successive marches; and when he arrived in the neighbourhood of Bahādur, he on the following day marched forward with his army arrayed for battle. Bahādur met him with great pride and self-confidence, and began to act with great gallantry. But suddenly an <sup>3</sup>arrow, discharged from the bow-string of destiny struck him on the side; and Zain Khān with the blood-letting blade of his lance, hurled him from the saddle to the ground; and cut off his head which had been filled with so much pride, and sent it to the Sultān. This victory was the result of the skilful work of Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk and Zain Khān; and it gave much pleasure and happiness to all

<sup>1</sup> He is called *مخدوم اعظم صدر جهان* in one MS., and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. he is called, apparently by mistake, only *اعظم صدر جهان*. He was called something else before; see note 2, page 124. Firishtah, however, calls him *مشرق العمل* in both places.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah's account agrees generally, but he says that Maḥmūd Shāh, (*ناچار*, i.e., having no other alternative, or being unable to induce Bahādur to submit) sent for Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk. He also says that Quṭb-ul-mulk and others accompanied Fakhr-ul-mulk from Panāla; but Maḥmūd Shāh sent Quṭb-ul-mulk back to go on with the siege of Panāla, for fear that Bahādur might advance in that direction and the trouble might be prolonged. Firishtah also says that Bahādur had two thousand horsemen, most of whom were *Gilānīs* and *Mazandarānīs*, and *Irāqīs*, and *Khurāsānīs*, and fifteen thousand infantry, and many cannon and muskets.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah says he died (*در گذشت*) on being struck by the arrow, but somewhat inconsistently adds, that Zain Khān, brother of Fakhr-ul-mulk, and according to another statement Main Khān cast him down from his saddle by striking him with his lance.

classes, high and low. At the time of the return of Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk, the Sultān sent the amīrs and the troops and all the retainers to welcome him : and <sup>1</sup> conferred on him the title of Khwājah Jahān : and in the same *majlis*, a special robe of honour and a jewelled belt and an Arab horse and an elephant were bestowed on him : and the horses and weapons which Bahādūr had brought as tribute were conferred on Zain Khān.

Two or three days after the victory (the Sultān) entered the fort of Panāla and sent <sup>2</sup> Malik 'Ain-ul-mulk from there to the island (of Goa), so that he might take possession of it by transfer from Bahādūr : and send all Bahādūr's property and equipage : and bring Malik Sa'id his brother to the court, after giving him assurance of royal favour. After some days, 'Ain-ul-mulk came back, bringing Malik Sa'id with him. He also passed before the eyes of the Sultān fifty elephants and three hundred Arab horses and much money and other things belonging to Bahādūr. As marks of loyalty were patent on the forehead of Malik Sa'id he received the title of Bahādūr Malik in the same *majlis* (i.e., in the *majlis* in which he was presented before the Sultān). The properties and territories of Bahādūr were, with the advice and concurrence of the *razārs*, entrusted to 'Ain-ul-mulk : and the Sultān returned towards the capital. When he arrived in the town of Bijāpūr, he halted in a <sup>3</sup> garden house which had been built by Khwājah Jahān Fakhr-ul-mulk : and spent two or three days there in pleasure and enjoyment. The Khwājah offered as tribute handsome and valuable things and Arab horses,

<sup>1</sup> Both Niẓām-ud-dīn and Firishtah had been giving him the title of Khwājah Jahān from a time anterior to this. Firishtah does not say that the title of Khwājah Jahān was conferred on him after this victory, but the word *Makhdūm*, which appears to be an entirely Dakinī honorific, was added to his title.

<sup>2</sup> He is called Malik 'Ain-ul-mulk Kan'fānī in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs (vol. II, page 543) calls him Mullik Ein-ul-Mulk Geelany. He is said to have been sent to the port of Goa.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah says the garden was called Kālābhāgh, and it had been planted by Malik-ut-tujjār Mahmūd Gāwān Khwājah Jahān, and not by Fakhr-ul-mulk Khwājah Jahān, as stated by Niẓām-ud-dīn. He also says that the Sultān visited it at the invitation of Yūsuf 'Adil Khān, after sending the camp on to the capital ; and the tribute was offered by Yūsuf 'Adil Khān.

more than can be contained in the desire of anybody, and was exalted by the gift of a special robe of honour and a jewelled belt.

On his arrival at the capital, the Sultān on the advice of the *amīrs* showed favour to the ambassadors of Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrātī, and bestowed 'Arab horses on them. He also conferred on them double of what was the customary (remuneration) of ambassadors. He also made over to the *rakīls*<sup>1</sup> five maunds of pearls of the weight of Delhi, and five elephants and one jewelled dagger as presents (to Sultān Maḥmūd Gujrātī). He sent for Kamāl Khān and Ṣafdar Khān and all the adherents of Sultān Maḥmūd, whom Bahādur had kept in imprisonment, to his presence, and granted favours and benefactions to them, and gave them permission to go back to Gujrāt. He also ordered that the twenty ships belonging to Sultān Maḥmūd, which Bahādur had looted should be made over to the Sultān's servants, so that the chain of inherited friendship and alliance might be strengthened.

<sup>2</sup> It has been narrated before, that in the early days of the Sultān's reign, all freshness and beauty had departed from the trees

<sup>1</sup> Firishlah also mentions these presents.

<sup>2</sup> It appears from Firishlah, that the defeat and death of Bahādur Gīlānī, and the events connected with them, took place on or before 901 A.H., 1495 A.D.; and Niẓām-ud-dīn says that Sultān Maḥmūd died in 927 A.H., while Firishlah says that he died in 928 A.H. Col. Briggs has 924 A.H., 1518 A.D., so that there was a period of 23 or 26 years between these events. Niẓām-ud-dīn passes over the account of what happened in the course of these years in about fifteen lines of the lith. ed. Firishlah gives a more detailed account. According to him, Qutb-ul-mulk Hamadōnī, who became the founder of the Qutb Shāhī dynasty was made *tarafdār* of Warangal, and got Ḥasanābād Gulbarga and Sughūr with their dependencies as his fief. At the same time the Sultān was informed that the *manṣabdārs* were the cause of the strength of the great *amīrs*, and of the latter rising in rebellion; and therefore except the *manṣabdār amīrs*, all other *manṣabdārs* were taken away from Dastūr Dīnār and were joined to the royal army. It may be mentioned, in explanation, that all commanders of less than five hundred were *manṣabdārs*; and those of five hundred and more were *amīrs*. Dastūr Dīnār was aggrieved at the *manṣabdārs* being taken away from him, and raised the standard of revolt, and took forcible possession of a part of Tilang, which was contiguous to Gulbarga. The Sultān demanded help from Yūsuf 'Adil Khān, and he came and joined the Sultān and Qāsim Barīd; and they fought with Dastūr Dīnār and 'Azīz-ul-mulk and all the Ḥabshīs and Dakīnīs who had joined him, near the town of Mahindrī

of the garden of Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh, owing to the assassination of Qiyām-ul-mulk Turk, and the flight of Niẓām-ul-mulk and 'Imūd-ul-

(Col. Briggs calls the place Mynulrgy; and says, in a note, that it is situated near Akalkote); and Dastūr Dīnār was defeated, chiefly by the manly exertions of Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān. He was taken prisoner, and was ordered by the Sultān to be put to death; but he was not only pardoned, but restored in his government, at the intercession of Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān. Some of the rebels took shelter in the fort of Saghūr, but it was seized, and made over to Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān.

In 902 A.H., Yūsuf Ghulām Dakinī and Tughrish Khān Dakinī and Mirzā Shams-ud-dīn (the first two are called Yoosooof Deccany and Yovarish Khan by Col. Briggs) entered into a conspiracy to destroy Qāsim Barīd; but the latter coming to know of it put them all to death. The Sultān also helped to extinguish the flames of slaughter and pillage; but he was so angry with Qāsim Barīd and the other Turks, that he would not, for one month, take their *salāms*; and at last, at the intercession of Shāh Muḥibb-ul-lah, he was induced with great reluctance to pardon them. After this the Sultān sank again into drunkenness and debauchery, so that his greatness and grandeur completely passed away from the minds of the people.

In 903 A.H., Maḥmūd Shāh asked the daughter of Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān, Bibi Satī, by name, who was one year old for his son Aḥmad who was four years of age. This was child marriage *in excelsis*. Col. Briggs does not give the age of the bride, but calls her "the infant daughter of Yoosooof Adil Khan". The age of the bridegroom, he says, was fourteen years. The marriage, it was arranged, would take place at Ḥasanābād Gulbarga; and it was arranged that when the bride would attain the age of ten years she should be sent to the Shāhẓāda. While the marriage festivities were still in progress, Dastūr Dīnār and Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān had a dispute about the fief of Gulbarga, the former arguing that Bijāpur up to the bank of the Bithura (Bīmā) should belong to Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān, and Gulbarga and Amatgīr as far as the boundary of Tilang should belong to him (Col. Briggs has Koalburga, Sagur and Etgeer); and the latter that Ḥasanābād, Gulbarga, Aland, Ganjantī and Kaliān should belong to him, so that his territory should abut on that of the Sultān. A battle was fought between the two contestants, and their partisans, in the neighbourhood of Ganjantī. Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān was victorious, and became very powerful, so that even the Sultān could not sit on the throne in his presence. Then the nobles retired to their fiefs; and Qāsim Barīd returned, and became *wakil* as before; and now his power became so great that the Sultān without his permission could not get even a drink of water when he was thirsty.

In 904 A.H., Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān led an army against Dastūr Dīnār; and the latter fled from Ḥasanābād Gulbarga; and at the suggestion of Qāsim Barīd went to Malik Aḥmad Niẓām-ul-mulk, who rendered him much help. Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān being unable to withstand them hastened to Aḥmadābād Bidar. The Sultān wrote to Malik Aḥmad Niẓām-ul-mulk and directed him not to assist





in Bidar, and the *sardārs* went to their respective places, even the little power and the small grandeur which had been left passed away.

In 912 A.H., Yūsuf 'Adil Khān and Fath-ul-lah 'Imād-ul-mulk and Fakhr-ul-mulk Dakinī Khwājah Jahān died and their sons succeeded them. Amīr Barīd tried to seize Bijāpūr but all his efforts were unsuccessful.

In 918 A.H., Quṭb-ul-mulk Hamadānī declared his independence, and removed the name of the Sultān from the *Khutba*, but he secretly sent five thousand *āfīs* every month to the Sultān.

In 920 A.H., Amīr Barīd raised a large army with the royal treasures, and taking the Sultān with him, marched to Gulbarga, and took it from the possession of Ismā'il 'Adil Khān; and made it over to the adopted son of Dastūr Dīnār, who had the name of Jahāngīr Khān and whom he gave the title of Dastūr-ul-mulk. The latter collected an army, and recovered all the forts on his side of the Pithōra (or the Bīma river), from Sāghir to Naldrug which had been in the possession of his father. Amīr Barīd then crossed the river with reinforcements from Malik Aḥmad Nizām-ul-mulk Baharī and Quṭb-ul-mulk, and marched to Bijāpūr. Ismā'il 'Adil Khān gave him battle near Bijāpūr; and completely defeated him, so that he fled from the battlefield. The Sultān fell from his horse, and remained helpless on the battlefield with his son, Aḥmad Khān. Ismā'il 'Adil Khān, however, treated him with great respect, and wanted to take him to Bijāpūr; but he remained in the town of Aland, where he was treated for his wounds. After a short time he went with Ismā'il 'Adil Khān to Hasanābād Gulbarga, the latter made over his sister, who had already been betrothed to him, to Shāhrūdā Aḥmad Khān. The Sultān then marched with three or four thousand Mughal horsemen, whom he obtained from Ismā'il 'Adil Khān, to Aḥmadābād Bidar. Amīr Barīd evacuated the capital, and retired to the fort of Urisa (Col. Briggs has Ousal. But soon after that, the officers of Ismā'il 'Adil Khān heard that Amīr Barīd had combined with Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk Baharī, and was advancing with a great army; and they returned to Bijāpūr in all haste. Amīr Barīd then came back to the capital; and treated the Sultān with even greater strictness and harshness than before, on account of his alliance with Ismā'il 'Adil Khān. The Sultān being unable to bear this treatment fled to 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Imād-ul-mulk at Kāwīl (Col. Briggs says he went to Gavul in Berar). 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Imād-ul-mulk received him with respect, and marched with him to crush Amīr Barīd. The latter took shelter in the fort; and sent men to Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk, who sent Khwājah Jahān to assist him. Amīr Barīd then sallied out to give battle; and 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Imād-ul-mulk met him, but the Sultān was bathing at the time. 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Imād-ul-mulk sent one of his principal men to summon the Sultān; and the latter told the Sultān that a man who engages himself in bathing at such a time becomes a subject of ridicule to his people. The Sultān became very angry at this rebuke, and galloped off to Amīr Barīd's army. 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Imād-ul-mulk then retired to his own country; and Amīr Barīd re-entered the capital.

Malik Barid became so powerful, that he left no one before (پیش) him, (i.e., probably to attend on him); and having strengthened the entrances and exits, did not permit that he should come out of his harem. He took the management of affairs into his own hand; and left Mahmūd Shāh nothing but the name of Sultān. Mahmūd Shāh wrote something about this to 'Imād-ul-mulk. The latter sent a reply to the effect that if His Majesty would come to Kāwil, this slave (i.e., he himself) would perform the duties of service, and would give a fresh splendour and currency to the affairs of the *sultānat*. Mahmūd Shāh then, with such pretexts as he could think of, fled to Kāwil. Malik 'Imād-ul-mulk welcomed his arrival, with respect and honour, and advanced with a large following to crush <sup>1</sup>Malik Barid. <sup>2</sup>When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the city of Bidar, Malik Barid, having equipped his army came forward to meet him. At the time when the armies were facing each other, the slave, who was the head of 'Imād-ul-mulk's tribesmen sent a message to the Sultān, that His Majesty should now mount, as the time of the battle had come. It so happened that at that time Mahmūd Shāh was engaged in washing his head. 'Imād-ul-mulk's slave said that when the Sultān was so negligent at the time of the battle, there was no doubt that it was a sign of misfortune.

with the Sultān, and placed the latter in such strict confinement that it was impossible for him again to attempt to escape. Firishtah is rather inconsistent in describing the last days of Mahmūd Shāh. He says first that he نه درمیان بود, i.e., he was not counted among the dead or among the living; but later on he says that he and his son, who were both weak in intellect and indolent, were contented with قصر و تختگاه و شراب و شاهد و ساتی و تغذیاء, i.e., with wine and mistresses and cup bearers and their throne and palace.

Firishtah places the death of Mahmūd Shāh on the 4th *Dhul Hijjah*, 924 A.H., (Col. Briggs has 928 A.H., October 21, 1518), and says that he reigned for 57 years and 20 days.

This is a very long note; but I have thought it necessary to give some account of the last years of the reign.

<sup>1</sup> Both the MSS. have ملک برید. The lith. ed. has برید, without any prefix. It appears however from Firishtah that Malik Qāsim Barid died in 924 A.H., and was succeeded by his son, Amīr Barid.

<sup>2</sup> This is mentioned by Firishtah among the incidents of the year 920 A.H.

Couplet :

Whoe'er doth ignorance and indolence adopt,  
His foot from the ground will fall, and his work from his  
hand.

These words appeared to be insolent to the Sultān. He then mounted his horse, and rode over to the army of Malik Barid ; and made a complaint about the slave of 'Imād-ul-mulk. 'Imād-ul-mulk seeing what had happened returned to Kāwil. After this, life became so miserable to the Sultān, that the maid-servants of Malik Barid carried his water and food to him, till in the year 927 A.H., he departed from this difficult lower world. The period of his reign was forty years and two months and three days.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF AḤMAD SHĀH, SON OF MAḤMŪD SHĀH.

<sup>1</sup> In the year 927 A.H., Malik Barid placed Sultān Aḥmad Shāh, son of Maḥmūd Shāh, on the throne, in the city of Bīdar, with the concurrence and advice of the *amīrs* and *khāns* ; but he left only the name of *bādshāh* to him ; and kept him (confined) in his house. The *amīrs* all took up their residences in their *jāgīrs* ; and were all independent of one another. The name of *bādshāh* was given to

---

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah says that Amīr Barid placed Aḥmad Shāh on the throne, because he had only a small territory and only three or four thousand horsemen ; and he was afraid that otherwise the rulers of the neighbouring countries would be tempted to seize Aḥmadābād Bīdar. He also says that the Sultān, like his father, was satisfied with sensual pleasures. As the stipend given to him by Amīr Barid did not suffice for his expenses, he broke up the jewelled crown of the Bahmanīs, which was valued at four hundred thousand *hūns* (Col. Briggs says in a note £1,60,000) ; and sold the gems secretly. When Amīr Barid became aware of this, he put many musicians and others, who were in the palace, to death ; and tried to get back the jewels ; but was unsuccessful, as the men who had bought them, had fled to Bijānagar and other places.

The Sultān sent men secretly to Ismā'il 'Ādil Khān, and complained of the hardships he suffered at the hands of Amīr Barid. Ismā'il 'Ādil Khān sent an ambassador with presents, and sent some verbal messages, but the Sultān died before the ambassador could arrive.

Firishtah says that Aḥmad Shāh died in 927 A.H., after a reign of two years and one month. Col. Briggs (vol. II, page 554) has the same year, but he reduces the duration of the reign to two years only.

poor oppressed Aḥmad Shāh for a period of two years and one month. He died in the year 929 A.H.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN,<sup>1</sup> SON  
OF MAḤMŪD SHĀH.

When the poor and helpless Aḥmad Shāh died, Malik Barīd, with the concurrence of the *amīrs* took 'Alā-ud-dīn, the brother of Aḥmad Shāh by the hand; and made him the *bādshāh*. He kept him (confined) in the house as he had kept his brother. The nobility of the nature and the high spirit of the prince, however, incited him to collect men round him, and to give fresh life to the ancient customs and rules; and like his great ancestors to conquer fresh territory. Malik Barīd coming to know of this in concert with Nizām-ul-mulk, son of Malik Nizām-ul-mulk and 'Imād-ul-mulk, son of 'Imād-ul-mulk and 'Ādil Khān, son of 'Ādil Khān Sawāī, took away the name of *salṭanat* from him. He in truth released him from bondage and confinement; and raised his brother in his place. The period of his reign, which was passed in confinement and imprisonment, was one year and eleven months.

---

<sup>1</sup> He is called the son of Maḥmūd Shāh in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. In the heading in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*, he is described as the son of Aḥmad Shāh Bahmanī. There is nothing said about his parentage in the account of his reign. In Col. Briggs's translation there is no mention of King Alla-ood-Deen's father. It appears however that Maḥmūd had three sons, Aḥmad Shāh, 'Alā-ud-dīn and Walī-ul-lah, and they were raised to the throne one after the other, but none of them had any real power.

According to *Firishtah* Amīr Barīd kept the throne unoccupied for fourteen days; but after that, for the same reason as before, he did not himself mount it, but placed 'Alā-ud-dīn on it. The latter, who was brave and intelligent and knew that his predecessors had ruined themselves by indulgence in wine and sensual pleasures, abstained from them; and exerted himself to effect the destruction of Amīr Barīd and the others, who had seized his ancestral dominion. With this object he flattered and conciliated Amīr Barīd. At the same time he collected a body of men for the assassination of Amīr Barīd; and kept them concealed in the palace. They were to seize Amīr Barīd and his associates when they came to offer their salutations on the morning of the first day of the month. When they came near the Sultān's apartment, one of the men who was hiding happened to sneeze. The plot was discovered. The conspirators were tortured and put to death; and the Sultān was imprisoned and soon after put to death. His reign extended to two years and three months.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTÂN WALI-UL-LAH,  
SON OF MAHMÛD SHÂH.

When <sup>1</sup> Malik Barîd, son of Barîd, gave Sultân 'Alî-ud-dîn freedom from the imprisonment of sovereignty, he brought his brother, who had the name of Wali-ul-lah, and appended the name of Sultân to him. He however without hesitation entered the Sultân's harem, and no one had the power to forbid him. Going there he conceived a passion for the Sultân's wife; and his evil passion led him to administer poison to Wali-ul-lah; and to take the latter's wife to himself. The period of his (*i.e.*, Wali-ul-lah's)<sup>2</sup> imprisonment did not reach a year.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF<sup>3</sup> KALAM-UL-LAH,  
SON OF MAHMÛD SHÂH.

After Sultân Wali-ul-lah had drunk the *sharbat* of martyrdom from the hand of <sup>4</sup> Malik Barîd; and after this nefarious deed had been perpetrated, the helpless Kalam-ul-lah was made Sultân; and he was kept under guard like his brother in the city of Bidar.

<sup>1</sup> Both MSS. leave out the word *Malik* before the second Barîd. Of course the father was Qâsim Barîd, and the son Amîr Barîd.

<sup>2</sup> According to Firishtah Wali-ul-lah reigned as a puppet in Amîr Barîd's hand for three years. He also like his brother tried to secure freedom. After this, Amîr Barîd confined him in his harem. The latter then conceived a passion for the Sultân's wife; and effected his death; and then took his wife to himself.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah also in the heading of his account of Sultân Kalam-ul-lah's reign calls the latter the son of Sultân Muḥmîd Bahmanî; but at the end of his account of the reign of Sultân Wali-ul-lah, calls Sultân Kalam-ul-lah, daughter's son of Yûsuf 'Adîl Shâh. This is incorrect, because it was Ahmad Shâh the eldest son of Muḥmîd Shâh, and not Muḥmîd Shâh himself, who married the daughter of Yûsuf 'Adîl Shâh. Col. Briggs makes the same mistake at the commencement of the account of Kullam Qulha Shâh Bahmanî where he describes the latter as "The son of Ahmad Shâh by the daughter of Yûsuf Adil Shâh". It will be seen from the account of the events of the year 903 A.H. in footnote, page 128, and also from Col. Briggs's History (vol. II, page 558) that it was Ahmad Shâh who was married to the daughter of Yûsuf Adil Shâh.

<sup>4</sup> Both MSS. have از دست ملک برید, without any reference to Malik Barîd's parentage; but the lith. ed. has از دست ملک برید بن برید.



Malik Barīd ; and up to this day which is in the year 1002 A.H., the rule of the Deccan is vested in these four dynasties. And something of their conditions will now be narrated.

## SECTION II. <sup>1</sup>THE NIZĀM-UL-MULKĪ LINE OR DYNASTY.

### AN ACCOUNT OF NIZĀM-UL-MULK BAHRI.

He was a slave of Brahman descent. His name had been <sup>2</sup>بهریو (Bhareu) ; and by change of letters, he was called Bahri. <sup>3</sup>His son Aḥmad, who had in his head an ambition to rule, commenced hostilities, the *vazīrs* of Sultān Kalīm-ul-lah made Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri a prisoner, and drawing a pencil across his eyes, ulti-

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah begins with an account of the 'Ādil Shāhī line, and then goes on with the Nizām Shāhīs. The title of the section is not given in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> Bhareu may be a corruption of Bhairo, which again is a corruption of Sanskrit Bhairava (lit. terrible) one of the names of the god Siva. Firishtah (lith. ed.) says that Malik Nāyib Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri's name was تیمابھت Timābhat and his father's name was بهریو Bhareu. Col Briggs (vol. III. p. 189) says his name was Timapa, son of Bhairoo. It is not clear to me why he was called Bhareu or Bahri which was his father's name, and not Timābhat which was his own name. According to Firishtah, Timābhat and Bhareu were taken prisoners by the Musalmāns in Bijānagar in the reign of Aḥmad Shāh Bahmanī ; and Bhareu's name was changed to Ḥasan when he was enlisted among the Sultān's slaves or guards. He was very intelligent, and so was sent to school with the prince who later became Muḥammad Shāh. In a short time he became well-known as Malik Ḥasan Bhareu ; but Muḥammad Shāh in his boyhood being unable to pronounce Bhareu changed it to Bahri ; and he became known as Malik Ḥasan Bahri. When Muḥammad became the Sultān, he made Malik Ḥasan Bahri a commander of one thousand horse ; and the latter gradually rose to be Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri ; and by the favour of Khwājah Jahān Gāwān was made *ṣarafdār* of Tilang. In the text-edition it is بهریو .

<sup>3</sup> This is a very brief and incomplete and confused account. Firishtah's account of the Nizām Shāhī dynasty begins with the reign of Aḥmad Nizām Shāh. The murder of Nizām-ul-mulk is only incidentally mentioned in it, where it is said that when Aḥmad Nizām Shāh, after capturing a number of forts such as Jaund and Lahagar and Tangī, etc., was engaged in the siege of the fort of Dandī Rājpurī, that he heard of the murder of his father. As this happened before 895 A.H., it could not have been the act of the *vazīrs* of Sultān Kalīm-ul-lah, as stated erroneously in the text ; but must have occurred in the reign of Maḥmūd Shāh which extended from 887 A.H. to 924, 927 or 928 A.H., according to different accounts.

mately put him to death. His rule had no stability, and has been narrated in the history of the Bahmanīs.

<sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF AḤMAD, SON OF NIẒĀM-UL-MULK BAḤRĪ.

<sup>2</sup> After the death of his father, NiẒām-ul-mulk, he declared his independence, and having taken possession of the whole of the country of Junir, he laid the foundation of a grand city in the middle of it; and called it Aḥmadnagar. He died after having ruled for forty years. As no comprehensive work containing particulars of the conditions of this dynasty, has come before my eyes, I am confining myself to this much.

<sup>3</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF BURHĀN NIẒĀM-UL-MULK, SON OF AḤMAD.

When Burhān sat in his father's place,<sup>4</sup> Shāh Ṭāhir who was one of the wisest men of the age, came from Sulṭāniya' in 'Irāq to the

<sup>1</sup> NiẒām-ud-dīn very frankly acknowledges that he did not come across any comprehensive history of the NiẒām Shāhī dynasty; and he has, therefore, made a very brief statement about Aḥmad NiẒām-ul-mulk. The latter, however, ruled for forty years and an account of his reign extends over about ten pages of the lith. ed. of Firishtah and about twenty-one pages of Col. Briggs's translation. It would be impossible for me to add much to NiẒām-ud-dīn's account without unduly increasing the volume of this work. I may say, however, that Aḥmad NiẒām-ul-mulk died in 914 A.H., 1518 A.D., leaving his son Burhān, a boy seven years of age, as his successor.

<sup>2</sup> The words بعد از فوت نظام الملک پدر خود are in one MS. only, but not in the other or in the lith. ed. I have, however, inserted them in the text.

<sup>3</sup> NiẒām-ud-dīn's account of the reign of Burhān NiẒām-ul-mulk or Burhān NiẒām Shāh, as Firishtah calls him, is very brief and incomplete. The reign extended, according to NiẒām-ud-dīn, to forty-eight years; and yet his narrative is confined to about nine lines of the lith. ed. Firishtah's account extends over eighteen pages of the lith. ed., and Col. Briggs's translation to about twenty-five pages. It is impossible for me to give even a brief summary of the events which occurred during this long period. I have, however, given a fairly comprehensive translation of the narrative in the lith. ed. of Firishtah (in the next note) of the conversion of Burhān Shāh and most of his subjects to the Shi'a form of the religion which appears to have taken place in 944 A.H., 1539 A.D.; as this is mentioned in the Ṭabaqāt. The translation in Col. Briggs, vol. III, page 228, is rather short and does not mention many very curious and interesting particulars.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah begins with a long and detailed account of the previous history of Shāh Ṭāhir. According to that Shāh Ṭāhir established himself in 926 A.H.



Deccan ; and became a companion and courtier of Burhān ; and making him adopt the *Imāmīa* religion became his guide in religious matters.

---

at Sultāniya as a religious teacher. Shāh Ismā'īl Ṣafvī, however, ordered him to be put to death. He then left Sultāniya in all haste ; and arrived at the port of Goa. From there, he went to Ismā'īl 'Adil Shāh at Bijāpūr ; but that ruler had no use for anyone except swordsmen and warriors ; and so he did not show him any favour. Shāh Ṭāhīr then started for the port of Chaul, in order to go on a pilgrimage to Mecca and Madīna. On the way he halted at the fort of Parinda, where Makhdūm Khwājah Jahān Dakīnī received him with great honour and respect. It so happened that at this time Burhān Niẓām Shāh had sent his teacher Maulāna Pīr Muḥammad Shīrwānī, on an embassy to Khwājah Jahān ; and he remained there for about a year as a pupil of Shāh Ṭāhīr. By this time the fame of Shāh Ṭāhīr's learning had spread all over the Deccan ; and when Pīr Muḥammad came back to Aḥmadnagar, and explained the reason of his long stay at Parinda, and dilated on Shāh Ṭāhīr's learning and wisdom Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk, who was fond of the society of learned men, invited Shāh Ṭāhīr to come to Aḥmadnagar. He came, and was received with great honour, and began to give lessons to the learned men of the capital. Soon after this Shāhẓāda 'Abd-ul-qādir, eldest son of Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk fell ill, and all the physicians were unable to effect his cure. Then Shāh Ṭāhīr suggested that he would be able to cure the prince, if Burhān Niẓām-ul-mulk would make offerings to the twelve Imāms. Burhān agreed to do so, but Shāh Ṭāhīr said that he did not suggest the making of offerings alone. He had something else in his mind, but he would disclose it only if Burhān would promise, that in the event of his suggestion not meeting with Burhān's approval, he would allow him and his sons to depart to Mecca. Burhān at once agreed, and bound himself by solemn oaths. Then Shāh Ṭāhīr inquired that if the prince was cured that night, would Burhān agree to read the *Khuṭba* in the name of the twelve Imāms, and endeavour to give currency to the Shī'a form of religion. Burhān agreed. That night Burhān sat by the side of the bed of 'Abd-ul-qādir ; and fell asleep, placing his head on the edge of the bed. Then he saw Muḥammad and the twelve Imāms in a dream ; and the next morning 'Abd-ul-qādir was cured. After that 'Abd-ul-qādir and his mother, Āmina Bibī, and all the members of the royal family accepted the Shī'a faith. Burhān wanted that the names of the twelve Imāms should be inserted at once in the *Khuṭba* ; but Shāh Ṭāhīr suggested that it would be better if he should convene an assembly, when the merits of the four religious sects of Islām could be discussed. The discussion continued for six months without much effect. Burhān Shāh spoke to Shāh Ṭāhīr ; and said, he was unable to ascertain the superiority of any of the religious sects discussed. After further discussions, Burhān Shāh described his dream at the time of prince 'Abd-ul-qādir's illness. Then most of the members of the royal family and the great officers, etc., accepted the Shī'a

In the year 945 A.H., Sulṭān Bahādur Gujrātī advanced to conquer the Deccan : and having arrived in the neighbourhood of Aḥmadnagar, encamped at a place, which is known as Kālāchabūtra. Burhān came forward in the way of sincerity and service : and did homage to him. The latter showed him favour : and gave him an umbrella, and other *insignia* of royalty. They say that Sulṭān Bahādur said to Shāh Ṭāhir, " Do not you accompany Burhān when he comes to me, so that there may be no derogation to your honour, for whenever Burhān comes to wait on me, he has to remain standing : and as you are connected with him, you have also to follow his example, and remain standing ". Sulṭān Bahādur held Shāh Ṭāhir in great respect.

As Burhān NiẒām-ul-mulk received strength and support from Sulṭān Bahādur, he had the public prayer read, and coins struck in his own name. He ruled for forty-eight years.

---

form of religion. Mullā Pīr Muḥammad and other learned men were angry and left the assembly. They then had a conference at Mullā Pīr Muḥammad's house, where some one suggested that Shāh Ṭāhir should be seized and put to death ; but Mullā Pīr Muḥammad said that as long as Burhān Shāh should be alive, they would not be able to effect their purpose. He suggested that Burhān Shāh should be deposed ; and prince 'Abd-ul-qādir placed on the throne ; after which Shāh Ṭāhir could be executed. Then they surrounded the fort, in which the palace was located. Burhān Shāh took measures for defending it ; but at the same time went to Shāh Ṭāhir, and explained the state of things. Shāh Ṭāhir who was versed in divination told Burhān Shāh to march out of the fort, when the rebels would at once submit. Burhān Shāh did so. Then Shāh Ṭāhir read a verse of the Qur'ān over a handful of earth : and threw it in the direction of the enemy : and told the heralds to go close to the latter, and call out that all loyal subjects should immediately come under the shadow of the royal umbrella ; and those who were disloyal (*harām-khūr*) should follow Mullā Pīr Muḥammad. Immediately the *amīrs* and the commanders of the army and the soldiers came over to Burhān Shāh ; while Mullā Pīr Muḥammad with a small number of soldiers went to his own house. He was seized by men who were sent by Burhān Shāh, and the latter ordered his execution ; but, at the intercession of Shāh Ṭāhir, the order of execution was cancelled, and he was kept in imprisonment in a fort for four years, after which, again at the intercession of Shāh Ṭāhir, he was restored to favour.

This is a long note, but I have inserted it, as it is very interesting in many ways. Col. Briggs has left the matter of the conversion of Burhān Shāh and his subjects entirely out of his translation.

## AN ACCOUNT OF ḤUSAIN NIẒĀM-UL-MULK, SON OF BURHĀN.

After his father <sup>1</sup> he sat in the latter's place. It is related traditionally that Burhān NiẒām-ul-mulk became enamoured of a <sup>2</sup> prostitute, and married her. One day he asked her in private, what persons she had liked best, and pleased most, among the men who had visited her during the time that she had lived in her former way. She named four persons. He had all four of them seized, and gave orders for those helpless persons being put to death. That prostitute was called Āmīna and Ḥusain NiẒām-ul-mulk was born of her.

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishtah the succession was not without a contest. Ḥusain Shāh, who was thirty years of age (Col. Briggs says incorrectly that he was in his thirteenth year), succeeded Burhān NiẒām Shāh as being his eldest son. But Shāhẓāda 'Abd-ul-qādir, who had much honour in the sight of his father, did not agree to Ḥusain Shāh's succession. He and the other princes left the palace, and two factions were formed, the foreigners and the Ḥabshīs joined Ḥusain NiẒām Shāh; and the Dakinīs, Hindūs and Musalmāns, were on the side of the other princes. There was every likelihood of a civil war; but Qāsim Beg Ḥakīm succeeded in detaching four hundred or five hundred *silahdārs* and *hawāladārs* from 'Abd-ul-qādir's party. Others joined Ḥusain NiẒām Shāh; and 'Abd-ul-qādir with some of his partisans fled to 'Imād-ul-mulk in Berār. He died there. The other princes fled to Bijāpūr; and 'Ādil Shāh espousing the cause of one of them, Shāh Ḥaidar, who was the son-in-law of Khwājah Jahān ruler of Parinda marched to recover Sholāpūr; but Ḥusain NiẒām Shāh attacked and captured the fort of Parinda.

Afterwards 'Ādil Shāh espoused the cause of Mirān Shāh 'Alī who was his cousin (*ammẓāda*); but Ḥusain NiẒām Shāh advanced with seven thousand horsemen, whom he obtained from Daryā 'Imād-ul-mulk, to Sholāpūr, which 'Ādil Shāh was then besieging, and after a severe battle the Bijāpūr army was defeated.

<sup>2</sup> She is called a *فاحشه* by NiẒām-ud-dīn. She is *امنه نام مولی* in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and in Col. Briggs's History (vol. III, p. 215), "Ameena a dancing girl". Firishtah says, Burhān made her the chief of his harem; and from her he learned to drink intoxicating liquors; and, owing to this, Mukammal Khān who was his *vakīl* and *vazīr* during his minority, and had worked with zeal and ability, resigned his office. It is also mentioned by Firishtah that when in 931 A.H. Burhān Shāh married Bibī Mariām, the sister of Ismā'il 'Ādil Shāh, Bibī Āmīna did not treat her well; and she complained to her brother; and there was a war between Burhān NiẒām-ul-mulk and his allies. Amīr Barīd, and 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Imād-ul-mulk on the one hand and Ismā'il 'Ādil Shāh on the other in which 'Imād-ul-mulk was defeated and retired in precipitation to Kāwīl; and Burhān NiẒām-ul-mulk became unconscious, through heat and thirst; and was carried away in a *pālī* to Aḥmadnagar.

At that time <sup>1</sup> Rām Rāj of Bijānagar, which in the Hindi language is known as <sup>2</sup> Bedbānagar, had acquired much strength and power. Husain Nizām-ul-mulk with 'Ādil Khān and Quṭb-ul-mulk and Malik Barīd attacked him. <sup>3</sup> Rām Rāj advanced to meet them with

<sup>1</sup> It appears from Sewell's "A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar," p. 109, that Rām Rāj or Rāmā Rāya, as Mr. Sewell calls him, was not the titular Rāja of Vijayanagar. Sadāsiva, who succeeded Achyuta in 1542 A.D., was the Rāja *de jure*, but he "was virtually a prisoner in the hands of Rāmā Rāya, the eldest of three brothers, at first nominally his minister, but afterwards independent".

\* "These three men held the government of the kingdom till 1565, when the empire was utterly overthrown by a confederation of the five Muhammadan kings of the Dakhan, already mentioned, at the battle of Talikota—so-called—and the magnificent capital was almost wiped out of existence." It appears also from Mr. Sewell's History, p. 184, note 1, that Rāmā Rāya was married to a daughter of Krishna Deva, who was king of Vijayanagar from 1509 to 1530, A.D.

<sup>2</sup> The name is بيد بانگر and بيد مانگر in the MSS. and بيدا نگر in the lith. ed. In text بيد نانگر.

<sup>3</sup> This is a very brief and incorrect account of the relations between the Nizām Shāhī rulers and those of Bijānagar and the final defeat and death of Rām Rāj. It appears from Firishtah, that the relations between Burhān Nizām Shāh and Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh were strained; and in 950, Burhān Shāh sent Shāh Tāhir to congratulate Jamshīd Quṭb Shāh on his accession; and on that occasion he instigated Rām Rāj and Quṭb Shāh to invade and conquer a part of the 'Ādil Shāhī dominion. 'Ādil Shāh, however, conciliated both Nizām Shāh and Rām Rāj. Some time after that, Burhān Shāh at the instigation of Rām Rāj advanced to Gulbarga. 'Ādil Shāh went forward to meet Rām Rāj and a great battle ensued in which Burhān Shāh was at first victorious; but in the end he was attacked by 'Ādil Shāh, when his troops were engaged in plundering; and was signally defeated, and fled to Almadnagar, leaving behind his royal umbrella and standards and elephants and artillery.

After various other operations and after the death of Shāh Tāhir, Burhān Nizām Shāh again resolved to attack the Bijāpur territory and sent ambassadors to Rām Rāj. The latter was put to great straits by the Marhatta cavalry under Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh. Burhān Nizām Shāh attacked 'Ādil Shāh's camp, when he and his nobles and soldiers were engaged in celebrating the 'Id, and slew many of them and compelled the rest to run away in all haste. After this Kaliān was surrendered by the garrison. In the mean time, 'Ādil Shāh marched into the Nizām Shāhī territory, and devastated Bīr and other *parganas*; and laid siege to Parinda and captured it. After that 'Ādil Shāh went back to Bijāpur and Burhān Nizām Shāh marched towards Parinda. The *thānadār*

one hundred thousand horsemen and two thousand elephants, and arranged them in order of battle: and it was likely that the four

being panic-struck left the place and Nijam Shah recovered it, and made it over to Shirshah Jahān, and returned to Ahmadnagar.

He again opened negotiations with Rām Rāj: and passing through the Bijapur territory, met him in the neighbourhood of Bāichūr: and they settled that Bāichūr and Madkal should be shared, and Arund belong to Rām Rāj: and Cholepur and Gulbarga to Burhān Shah. They accordingly seized these forts. In 961 Burhān Shah and Rām Rāj again invaded the Bijapur territory, and settled that they should besiege the fort of Gajpur and Bijar, and should seize the whole of the neighbouring territory up to the river Beimā: and then seize Bijapur and Gulbarga. In 961 when they advanced towards Bijapur, Adil Shah being unable to meet them retired to Panola. Burhān Shah was engaged in the siege of Bijapur and was about to seize it, when he fell ill and going back to Ahmadnagar died there. Shirshah prints out that Mahmūd Shah of Gujarat and Sulaim Shah Sar died in the same year.

After the coronation of Husain Nijam Shah and the death of Ibrahim Adil Shah the former sent ambassadors to Ibrahim Qurb Shah: and they marched from their respective capitals and met at Gulbarga, and laid siege to it: and were about to capture it, when Muhammad Khan Arghwan, the minister of Ibrahim Qurb Shah persuaded the latter to detach himself from Husain Nijam Shah: and the latter had to return to his capital without obtaining his object. Ali Adil Shah who had succeeded Ibrahim Adil Shah now entered into an alliance with Rām Rāj and Qurb Shah, in order to retaliate the injury done to him. Husain Nijam Shah sent Mulla Ali Masumdar to Darya Imād-ul-mulk of Bidar: and the embassy succeeded in bringing about an interview between his master and Imād-ul-mulk near Shapur (the hill, ad of Shirshah says on the bank of the Ganges, but Col. Briggs says more correctly, on the bank of the Godavari): and a marriage was arranged and celebrated with great splendour between the daughter of Imād-ul-mulk and Husain Nijam Shah.

Some time after, in the year 967 A.D., Ali Adil Shah with Rām Rāj and Qurb Shah advanced towards Ahmadnagar. Husain Nijam Shah's minister suggested that he should surrender the fort of Kāshān to Adil Shah and make peace with the latter. Husain Nijam Shah did not agree, and said that it would be a matter of discredit to him, if he would surrender a fort which his father had conquered with the sword. The allies arrived at Ahmadnagar with one lakh of horsemen and two lakhs of foot-soldiers. Husain Nijam Shah left Ahmadnagar in charge of his officers and retired towards Panan, so that he might get Darya Imād-ul-mulk and Mirān Mohammad Shah Fāruqi and Ali Baid to unite with him. It so happened, however, that Ruhan Jahān brother of Amir Baid, who was in charge of Imād-ul-mulk's affairs, not only dissuaded the latter from helping Husain Nijam Shah, but proceeded himself with five

rulers should meet with a defeat, when by an act of fate, a cannon ball, shot from the army of Niẓām-ul-mulk, hit Rām Rāj and killed

thousand horsemen and foot-soldiers to devastate Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh's territories. He was, however, defeated by Shāh Mullā Muḥammad Naishāpūrī, whom Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh sent against him. In the meantime the allied sovereigns laid siege to Aḥmadnagar; but Quṭb Shāh thinking that it would be unwise, that 'Ādil Shāh would have too great a power over Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh, allowed free passage for provisions and emissaries of Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh to enter the fort, through his lines. 'Ādil Shāh and Rām Rāj, coming to know this, demanded an explanation from Quṭb Shāh, who without giving it, left in the night and went back to Golkonda. Rām Rāj and 'Ādil Shāh finding it difficult to maintain their position retired to the town of Āshtī: and there planned that they should first seize the fort of Parinda, and afterwards return and capture Aḥmadnagar. Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh then made overtures to Rām Rāj for peace. Rām Rāj agreed on three conditions, all of which Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh found it necessary to accept. Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh made over the keys of Kaliān to Rām Rāj in fulfilment of one of the latter's conditions; and he sent them to 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh.

In the beginning of 970 A.H., Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh and Quṭb Shāh met in the neighbourhood of Kaliān, and proceeded to lay siege to it, and were about to capture it, when Rām Rāj and 'Ādil Shāh arrived in that neighbourhood, with a large army. Burhān 'Imād-ul-mulk, who had succeeded his father, and 'Alī Barīd joined 'Ādil Shāh. Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh then raised the siege and sent away his heavy luggage and his son and other members of his family towards the fort of Aḥsa; and he himself intending to give battle to the enemy encamped at a distance of six *karōhs* from them. The next day Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh advanced to carry on a *jihād* against Rām Rāj: and Quṭb Shāh also marched forward, with such men as he had, against 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh and his Musalmān allies. It so happened, that although it was not the rainy season, there was heavy rain that day; and Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh's guns, etc., were rendered useless. Rām Rāj and 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh, becoming aware of this, attacked Quṭb Shāh's camp, and he fled without making a struggle, and took up a position behind Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh's camp. Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh now saw that it was impossible for him to do anything, and retired towards his capital. He was pursued, but he showed such dauntless courage, that the pursuers, after a time, turned back. He then came to Aḥmadnagar *via* Aḥsa. 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh, Rām Rāj and their allies marched towards Aḥmadnagar, when Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh leaving the capital in charge of his officers, retired to Jūnir. The Hindūs of Rām Rāj's army destroyed mosques and palaces, and committed outrages on the women. 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh was shocked at this, but could not prevent it. He, however, advised Rām Rāj to raise the siege, and to go in pursuit of Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh. Rām Rāj agreed, and they went after Ḥusain Niẓām Shāh. The latter retired to the hilly country, after

him. His army was routed; and much booty fell into the hands of the amirs of the Deccan. Husain Nizām-ul-mulk ruled for thirteen years. He left two sons Murādāk and Burhān.

directing some of his officers to hover round the hostile army, and to carry on a guerilla warfare. They did so with much success, and as the rains were approaching, Rām Rāj encamped near the river Sen. There was heavy rain and the river was flooded, and about twenty thousand men and three hundred elephants and innumerable cattle were swept away, and drowned. On account of this catastrophe Rām Rāj started for his own country; and 'Alī Shāh proceeded to Naldurg and repaired the fort. Rām Rāj under the pretext of foregoing devastated portions of the Hājapūr and Giddamda territories, eventually obtained the cession of parts of those territories, before retiring to his own country.

After this in 1572 A.D., Husain Nizām Shāh and 'Alī 'Alī Shāh entered into matrimonial and political alliances; and they also secured the alliance of the other Musalmān sovereigns, except Burhān 'Imād-shāh, for the destruction of Rām Rāj. Nizām Shāh and Qutb Shāh and 'Alī Shāh and 'Alī Barīd advanced with their armies, and crossed the Krishnā, and encamped at a distance of six *lozoks* from it. Rām Rāj advanced with a formidable army to meet them; and they thinking that it would be impossible to withstand him, made overtures for peace. Rām Rāj refused to listen to them. There was a great battle, in which the Hindus were defeated, mainly owing to the attacks by Husain Nizām Shāh's artillery. Rām Rāj was taken prisoner, when the *saddan* or throne on which he was riding was thrown down by the beaters, when they were charged by some of Husain Nizām Shāh's elephants. He was recognised, and taken to Husain Nizām Shāh, who ordered him immediately to be beheaded. This battle is known as the battle of Talikota, though according to Mr. Sewall, see note 2, page 120 of his book, it did not take place there. Talikota is a small fortress and town near the Krishnā. "The battle took place ten miles from Rāma Rāja's camp south of the river, wherever that might have been." Mr. Sewall thinks it probable that it took place near the celebrated fort of Mudkal. "The ford crossed by the allies would appear to be that at the head of the river at Ingalgū; and the decisive battle seems to have been fought in the plain about the little village of Bāyapur to Bhōgapur, on the road leading directly from Ingalgū to Mudkal." Col. Briggs has also pointed out that the battle "has been called the battle of Talikota by the Muhomedans because the head-quarters of the several sovereigns were near that village. The battle was fought on the south bank of the Krishnā, nearly twenty rulers off." (See footnote, page 126, vol. III of his History.)

This again is a very long note, but I have considered it necessary to insert it so that there might be a correct narrative of the events, as far as that can be ascertained by a reference to Firishtah.

## AN ACCOUNT OF MURTAḌA NIZĀM-UL-MULK.

By the order and testamentary direction of his father, he succeeded the latter. He was benevolent and friendly to the poor.  
<sup>1</sup> Khawājah Mirak Harvī (of Herāt) was his minister in the beginning of

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishtah, Murtaḍa's mother Khunza Humāyūn (called Khooza Sooltana by Col. Briggs) carried on the government for six years, with Mullā 'Ināyat-ul-lah as the *pēshwā*, and in accordance with the advice of Qāsim Bēg Ḥakīm. She raised her three brothers to the highest rank of nobility and sat daily with Mullā 'Ināyat-ul-lah to transact public business from behind the *parda*. At this time, 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh advanced against the Hindūs of Bijānagar. Venkatādri, the brother of Rām Rāj applied to Khunza Humāyūn for help. She led an army into the Bijāpūr territory, and compelled 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh to retire. Peace was, however, soon made between the two Musalman princes; and they entered into an alliance against Tufāl Khān, the prime minister of Burhūn 'Imād Shāh, who had seized his master's dominions, and who had not joined them in their invasion of Bijānagar. They plundered the country; and on the approach of the rains, Tufāl Khān propitiated 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh; and the 'Ādil Shāhī and Nizām Shāhī armies returned to their respective territories.

In 976 A.H., 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh invaded the Ahmadnagar territory. Khunza Humāyūn sent some *amirs* against the 'Ādil Shāhī army which was under Kishwar Khān; but the latter defeated them; and they retired to Ahmadnagar. After this some of the courtiers of Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh told the latter that on account of Khunza Humāyūn's partiality to her brothers and other favourites, the army was in a wretched condition. They suggested that she should be seized, and after some delay Murtaḍa Nizām agreed. They were preparing to enter the harem, when Khunza Humāyūn sent for Murtaḍa Nizām; and the latter, thinking that his mother had discovered the plot, made a clean breast of it, in order to exculpate himself. She put one of the conspirators under arrest, and the others escaped. Some of them went to Bijāpūr and some to Gujrāt. Khunza Humāyūn gave them assurances of safety, and asked them to return.

Then in 977 A.H., she started with her son against Kishwar Khān the Bijāpūr general. In the course of the month, Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh determined to take the government into his own hands; and sent a message to that effect to his mother. She came out on horseback ready armed, but she was soon seized, and her attendants fled. Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh now returned to Ahmadnagar; and levying additional forces attacked the fort of Dārūr; and seized it in a very dramatic manner, after Kishwar Khān had been slain by an arrow, which hit him on his breast. Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh then invaded Bijāpūr; but shortly after that a treaty was concluded between him and 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh.



his reign; and had the title of Changiz Khān conferred on him. He conquered the country of Berār from <sup>1</sup>Tufāl Khān; and annexed it to the territories of Murtaḍa Nizām-ul-mulk. After the <sup>2</sup>death of Changiz Khān, it so happened, that a relationship of passion (نسبت فوری) was produced between Nizām-ul-mulk and the son of a bird-seller. He conferred on him the title of Muṣāhib Khān; and made <sup>3</sup>him his *rakīl*. That wretch having stretched his hands for plunder and ravage, went into people's houses; and stretched his hands over their families and children. He also endeavoured to put to death such of the *amīrs*, as he believed to be unlikely to obey

It was sometime after this, that Khwājah Mirak had the title of Changiz Khān conferred on him, and was appointed as the *rakīl*.

<sup>1</sup> The name is 'Add Khān instead of Tufāl Khān in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> Nizām-ul-dīn does not mention the circumstances under which the death of Changiz Khān took place. According to Firishtah Shāh Mirzā Isfahānī, who was *Lājī* or chamberlain of Qutb Shāh believed that Nizām Shāh's army would march against Bolar. He first of all offered a large bribe to Changiz Khān so that he might give up the idea of the invasion. Changiz Khān indignantly refused the bribe, upon which Shāh Mirzā Isfahānī bribed Šāhib Khān, whom Firishtah describes as a *معشوق نظام الملك*, and Col. Briggs as a favourite minion of the king; and told him to report to Nizām Shāh that Changiz Khān wanted to make himself the ruler of Berār. Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh at first did not believe the report; but Šāhib Khān persisted in the accusation, and referred Nizām Shāh to Shāh Mirzā Isfahānī. The Sultān sent for him, and Shāh Mirzā of course corroborated Šāhib Khān's statement. Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh then gave some credence to the accusation; but to make assurance doubly sure, he told Changiz Khān, that he was tired with the long stay in the camp, and wanted to go back to Ahmadnagar. Changiz Khān told him that he should remain there for sometime longer. This confirmed the Shāh's suspicions, and his demeanour towards Changiz Khān changed. The latter perceived this, and for some days, on the pretext of illness, he did not go and wait on Murtaḍa Shāh. This confirmed the latter's belief and he sent a *rakīl* to Changiz Khān, with a poisoned draught, which he was to represent as a medicine. Changiz Khān at first refused to drink it; but in the end remembering Murtaḍa Shāh's kindnesses to him, drank it off, after writing a petition to the latter.

It will be seen from the above that Šāhib Khān was already a minion of the Sultān, before the death of Changiz Khān.

<sup>3</sup> This does not agree with Firishtah's account. According to him, Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh first made Hukīm Muhammad Miṣrī his *rakīl*, but after six months dismissed him and appointed Qāḍī Beg Yazdī to that post. But Firishtah also mentions the outrages committed by Šāhib Khān on the people, and even on the *amīrs*.

his behests. After a time he marched to attack the *amīrs* of Berār, among whom were Mir Murtaḍa and Khudāwand Khān, and others. As the latter knew his intention they forestalled him, and slew him.

Murtaḍa NiẒām Shāh grieved much, and <sup>2</sup> saw no remedy except in madness. At this time the derangement of his brain became violent : and he secluded himself in <sup>3</sup>Bāgh-i-Bihisht (the garden of paradise) ; and never came out of it. He also did not allow any one to go near him ; and it was only rarely, that any one was received in audience. At all times the *vazīrs* were engaged in the affairs of the state, and maintained the stability of the government. If a matter of importance had to be dealt with, they submitted a written report to him : and he wrote a reply to it.

When six years had passed in this way, <sup>4</sup> His Majesty the Khalīfa-i-Ilāhī sent Pishran Khān, who was one of the old servants of the threshold to the Deccan, so that he might acquaint himself with the state of things in that country, and submit a report about them.

<sup>1</sup> The manner in which he was killed is described by Firishtah. It would appear, that he left the court in anger. Murtaḍa NiẒām Shāh sent some men to call him back ; and they put him to death, and represented to Murtaḍa NiẒām Shāh that he fell when resisting their endeavours to take him back.

<sup>2</sup> The meaning of this is not clear. It would appear from Firishtah's account that he was in his senses ; but he became convinced that he could not administer justice to his subjects ; and so freed himself from all responsibilities ; and left everything in charge of his minister ; and himself went into retirement.

<sup>3</sup> According to Firishtah, he first retired to an apartment inside the fort of Ahmadnagar, which was called Bāghdād ; and later to a garden house called *Hasht Bihisht*. Col. Briggs says that the garden and the palace in it were still to be seen in Ahmadnagar, in his time. It was then known as the *Behishti Bagh* (vol. III, page 261).

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah does not appear to mention the mission of Pishran Khān ; but he says that in 984 A.H., Akbar came to the frontiers of Mālwa, hunting. On receiving information of this, Murtaḍa NiẒām Shāh at once started for Daulatābād in a *pālī* with only about one hundred followers. The *amīrs* submitted to him that it would be unwise to advance with such a small force. He waited for sometime till six thousand or seven thousand of his special troops had assembled. His generals again represented that it would be better to wait for his artillery. He did not agree to this ; but the scouts brought information, at this time, that Akbar had gone back to his capital. Murtaḍa NiẒām Shāh then returned to Ahmadnagar and again secluded himself in *Hasht Bihisht*.

When Pishrau Khān arrived at Ahmadnagar, Asad Khān Rūmī, who was at that time the *vakīl* of Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh, and who, communicated with the latter when from time to time he felt somewhat better and was in his right mind, brought him out; and he had an interview with Pishrau Khān. Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh then expressed his sincerity and faithful service to the threshold of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī. Pishrau Khān said "His Majesty has ordered me that I should ascertain the cause of your secluding yourself". He replied "There are many men round me, and the revenues of my kingdom are not sufficient for the payment of their expenses. I come out rarely on account of my being ashamed of men". He sent back Pishrau Khān with much tribute and elephants of immense size.

It so happened that <sup>1</sup>Burhān brother of Murtaḍa Nizām-ul-mulk escaped from prison, and rose in revolt. The *amīrs* brought out Murtaḍa, and defeated Burhān. The latter fled, and went as a suppliant to the threshold of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī, and received imperial favours. Murtaḍa again secluded himself in that garden. No one went near him. This happened in the year 996 A.H. A period of three years passed in this way. There was war several times between the armies of Nizām-ul-mulk and 'Adil Khān, and peace was each time made. A Circassian (Karjī) slave of Shāh Tahmāsp of the name of Ṣalābat Khān acquired an ascendancy in the service of Nizām-ul-mulk; and became his minister plenipotentiary. Mir Murtaḍa and Khudāwand Khān and the other *jāgīrdār amīrs* of Berār had enmity with Ṣalābat Khān. They came with a large force, and attacked Ahmadnagar. Ṣalābat Khān fought with them and defeated them. The Berār *amīrs* then fled, and went for protection to the threshold of the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī, which was the asylum of the world. They obtained reinforcements there, and again came back to Berār. An account of these events has already been given in its place.

---

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishtah the revolt of Burhān took place before the death of Ṣāhib Khān. Burhān escaped from the fort of Junīr; and was defeated by Ṣalābat Khān, and fled to Bijāpūr. He returned again, when some disaffected *amīrs* conspired to place him on the throne; but the plot was discovered by Ṣalābat Khān; and he had again to make his escape. After that he sought an asylum in Akbar's Court.

In his old days, Murtaḍa Nizām-ul-mulk became enamoured of a <sup>1</sup> prostitute of the name of Fattū. On account of the fact that a Saiyid named Mir Bihishtī had this woman in his house for some-time : and he had a son of the name of Ismā'il by another woman, Fattū used to describe Ismā'il as her brother. Ismā'il became the *rakīl* of Nizām Shāh ; and put Ṣalābat Khān in prison. They say that he showed a <sup>2</sup> writing with a *س* from Nizām-ul-mulk to the effect that Ṣalābat Khān should remain in a fortress (or prison). Ṣalābat Khān sent for a <sup>3</sup> litter ; and getting into it <sup>4</sup> went to the fortress. Although the men in charge of the fort said that Murtaḍa Nizām-ul-mulk was not in his right senses, and did not know anything about the order ; and loyalty and faithfulness to the salt required that he should

<sup>1</sup> She is called a *فاحشه فتونام* in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. Firishtah calls her *فتعی شاه لولی* ; and Col. Briggs has "Futteh Shah a dancer"; and he described her apparently as a man, and not as a woman (vol. III. page 264).

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has *نوشته باصدا از مرتضی نظام الملک*. The other MS. omits *با* ; while the lith. ed. has *با ص*. The *ص* is an abbreviation of *صحيح* (correct) and is equivalent to a signature.

<sup>3</sup> Both MSS. have *dālī*, but the lith. ed. has *pālki*.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah also says that Ṣalābat Khān, in a quixotic spirit of loyalty, immured himself in the fort of Dandrājpur. He gives a detailed account of the causes of Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh's displeasure with him. First of all, there was some trouble about some very curious and valuable necklaces which Fattū demanded. Ṣalābat Khān, in consultation with the other ministers, had two copies of the necklaces made, and made them over to her. She found out that the necklaces given to her were copies, and complained to Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh. Another cause was, that Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh took it into his head, at the suggestion of the women about him, that his son Mīrān Ḥusain wanted to dethrone him, and attempted to put him to death. Ṣalābat Khān refused to make the Shāhzāda over to him ; and put the matter off. At this time Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shāh invaded the Nizām Shāhī dominions, and demanded that the marriage of his sister with Shāhzāda Mīrān Ḥusain should be celebrated ; or the bride should be sent back to Bijāpur. Ṣalābat Khān refused compliance with the demand, unless Shōlāpur should be first ceded to Nizām Shāh. Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shāh, becoming angry at this, besieged Aūsa. Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh was enraged with Ṣalābat Khān ; and after reproaching him said, "I am tired of your disobedience, but I have no power to put you into prison". Ṣalābat Khān said, "Name a fortress, and I shall put myself in chains, and go and shut myself up there". Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh named the fort of Dandrājpur ; and Ṣalābat Khān at once went and shut himself up there.

attend to the welfare of his master, he did not accept this argument ; and said " I have nothing to do with these contentions. I have no alternative except obedience."

When Ṣalābat Khān ceased to be in the way Ismā'īl became the *vakīl muṭlaq* (minister with absolute power) ; and he and the woman Fattū acquired complete power and authority. Ismā'īl committed various acts of tyranny and oppression. As he had made <sup>2</sup> Ḥasan 'Alī, son of Sulṭān Ḥusain Sabazwārī his *nāyib*, and had conferred the title of Mirzā Khān on him, the latter when the tyranny and violence (of Ismā'īl) went beyond all bounds, got most of the *amīrs* to join him, and made himself the *vakīl* of Murtaḍa NiẒām-ul-mulk. When he found the field unoccupied, the ambition to rule got into his head ; and he released (Mīrān) Ḥusain, the son of Murtaḍa NiẒām-ul-mulk, who had nearly attained his majority, and was imprisoned in a fort, and made him the ruler of the country. <sup>3</sup> They

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah, however, says that Murtaḍa NiẒām Shāh made Qāsim Bēg Ḥakīm his *vakīl*, and Mirzā Muḥammad Taqī Nāẓirī his *vazīr*.

<sup>2</sup> According to Firishtah, however, it was Sulṭān Ḥusain Sabazwārī himself, and not his son who was made regent with the title of Nāẓir Khān, by Murtaḍa NiẒām Shāh, because the other minister did not agree to the latter's proposal to effect the destruction of Shāhizāda Mīrān Ḥusain.

<sup>3</sup> NiẒām-ul-dīn's account of the way in which Murtaḍa NiẒām Shāh was killed is correct but incomplete. He has omitted all mention of an attempt by Murtaḍa NiẒām Shāh to burn his son Mīrān Ḥusain to death. He told his ministers, Qāsim Bēg Ḥakīm and Mirzā Muḥammad Taqī Nāẓirī that he had great longing to see his son. They were very thankful to God for this change in their master's disposition, and sent the Shāhizāda into the fort. Murtaḍa at first showed much affection towards the prince ; and put him in a chamber near Bāghdād (see page 147, note 3). Then he set fire to the bed clothes, and shut the doors from the outside. When Mīrān Shāh woke up he ran to the door, and called out for help. Fataḥī Shāh, it must be said to her credit, opened the door ; and sent the prince to the ministers. There was not, therefore, very much to choose between the father and the son ; but it may be said that the former was, or affected to be mad. But evidently there was much method in his madness.

It may be mentioned here, that Firishtah's account of the events in Murtaḍa NiẒām Shāh's reign is that of a contemporary, who took part in some of the events, which he has recorded. According to his account, he was employed by Murtaḍa NiẒām Shāh to watch Nāẓir Khān, when the latter turned against him, and took up the cause of Shāhizāda Mīrān Shāh.

threw Murtada Nizām-ul-mulk into a hot (Turkish) bath, and shut all the doors; and the poor man died of the heat. The rule of Murtada Nizām-ul-mulk extended to twenty-six years and some months.

AN ACCOUNT OF HUSAIN NIZĀM-UL-MULK, SON OF MURTADA  
NIZĀM-UL-MULK, WHO WAS CALLED MİRĀN HUSAIN.

Mirzā Khān kept him as a figurehead and himself carried on the government. <sup>1</sup>The prince on account of his youth was occupied during the whole of his time in pleasure and dissipation, and in cock fights and in wandering about in the *bāzār*. He roamed about during most of the time in the lanes and *bāzārs* in a drunken state in the company of women of the town, and committed harsh and offensive acts. <sup>2</sup>As the strength and power of Mirzā Khān went beyond all bounds, the old *amīrs* of the Deccan became jealous and envious of him; and induced the young and inexperienced Husain Nizām-ul-mulk to get rid of him. Accordingly <sup>3</sup>a feast was arranged in the house of

<sup>1</sup> The character of Husain Nizām-ul-mulk as given by Firishtah does not quite agree with that given by Nizām-ud-dīn. Firishtah also says that he was a young man of dissolute character; but he was also of a cruel and savage disposition. When he went about in a drunken state in the city, he killed men whom he met and who were guilty of no crime whatever, with arrows and musket shots and the sword.

<sup>2</sup> Before this however, according to Firishtah, some of his associates informed Husain Shāh, that Mirzā Khān had brought Husain Shāh's uncle from the fort of Asīr (the lith. ed. has اسیر, and Col. Briggs, vol. III, p. 268, Joonere); and was keeping him concealed in his house, with the object of placing him on the throne, after deposing Husain Shāh. The latter ordered Mirzā Khān to be placed in imprisonment; but when the accusation was found to be false, he reinstated him, and increased his honours. Mirzā Khān suggested, that in order to prevent future accusations of this kind, all the surviving male members of the royal family should be put to death; and fifteen persons, namely, his uncles and their male offsprings, were put to death in one day.

<sup>3</sup> The account of this feast in the text agrees severely with that given by Firishtah. The name of the man who gave the feast is also Ankas Khān in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but Col. Briggs, vol. III, p. 271, Bungush Khan. The man who became ill, or according to Firishtah, feigned to be ill as previously arranged, with Mirzā Khān was, according to Firishtah Aqā Mīr Sharwānī, and the date of the feast was Thursday, the 12th Jamādī-ul-awwal, 997 A.H. Col. Briggs gives the 10th Jumad-ool-awul 997 A.H., March 15th, 1588 A.D., as the date.

Ankas Khān, who was a foster-brother (a son of the wet-nurse) of Husain Nizām-ul-mulk, and was of the same age as he; and Mirzā Khān was invited to it. He, however, got information of the intention (of his enemies); and did not attend the feast, sending excuses for his absence. It so happened that after the feast Saiyid Murtaḍa Sharwānī, a friend of Mirzā Khān, who was among those who had come to the feast, got up vomiting and cried out and complained that they had given him poison. Mirzā Khān went and saw Saiyid Murtaḍa; and after having arranged matters went to wait on Husain Nizām-ul-mulk, he told the latter, "Saiyid Murtaḍa is a <sup>1</sup> man highly esteemed, and is lying on the bed of death; and air and water (climate or atmosphere) inside the fort are salubrious. He might, if you so order, be there for some days." <sup>2</sup> After obtaining permission he sent the man to the fort. <sup>3</sup> On the following day, he again waited on Husain Nizām-ul-mulk; and took him to enquire about the health of Saiyid Murtaḍa; and then imprisoned him, (i.e., Husain Nizām-ul-mulk), in an apartment there.

Couplet :

Place not thy foot on the path of deceit and fraud,  
For in the end, in the net of danger thou must be caught.

<sup>1</sup> The actual words are *مردی عزیز است*. Firishtah has *یکی از امراء بزرگ*. *شهابست*, i.e., is one of your great *amirs*.

<sup>2</sup> The account given by Nizām-ud-dīn of the way, in which the incarceration of Husain Nizām-ul-mulk was effected, is consistent. That given by Firishtah is somewhat different, and is rather confused. He says that Mirzā Khān reported to Husain Nizām-ul-mulk, that Āqā Mir Sharwānī should be sent *outside* the fort; and should be allowed to live in a part of *his* (i.e., the Sultān's) own palace. Afterwards Mirzā Khān went and reported that Āqā Mir's condition was serious; and suggested that it would be a great kindness, on his part, if he would go, and enquire after his health. Husain Nizām-ul-mulk then rode into the fort, with two or three companions, and was at once placed in confinement.

<sup>3</sup> The way in which the revolution was affected, as given by Firishtah, agrees mainly with that in the text. Firishtah however says, that two sons of Burhān, namely Ibrāhīm and Ismā'il, were brought from the fort of Lāhagar, where they had been imprisoned, so that one of them might be selected and placed on the throne: and eventually Ismā'il, the younger of the two, who was only twelve years of age was chosen to be the puppet Sultān.

The doors were then shut and placed in charge of his (Mīrzā Khān's) men. Saiyid Murtaḍa in complete health and strength, sat at the gate of the fort, and supervised everything. Mīrzā Khān had Ankas Khān also seized, and put him into prison. He sent Mīr Ṭāhir, son-in-law of Amīn-ul-mulk to the fort, and brought Ismā'īl son of Burhān who was the nephew of Murtaḍa NiẒām-ul-mulk out of prison; and he was brought to Aḥmadnagar.

When the news of the imprisonment of Ḥusain NiẒām-ul-mulk was bruited about, <sup>1</sup> Jamāl Khān Gujrātī, who was the commander of the *silāḥdārs*, and the slave Yāqūt who had the title of Khundāwand Khān united together, and having secured the union of the soldiers and other men with themselves, came in a crowd to the gate of the fort, and commenced to fire cannon. Mīrzā Khān came to the gate; and a great fight took place. Kishwar Khān, the uncle-in-law (*khāl*) of Mīrzā Khān and 'Alī Khān were slain. Mīrzā Khān and Saiyid Murtaḍa and Jamshīd Khān and Amīn-ul-mulk and Bhā'ī Khān and

---

<sup>1</sup> The account of the way in which Jamāl Khān came to support Ḥusain NiẒām-ul-mulk, and the latter was murdered by Mīrzā Khān and his partisans, as given in the text, agrees with that given by Firishtah. According to the latter, however, Jamāl Khān was the leader of the Dakinīs and Ḥabshīs, and Mīrzā Khān of the foreigners, other than the Ḥabshīs. He also says that Mīrzā Khān did nothing when Jamāl Khān had five or six thousand horsemen and many men on foot, including the people of the *bā'ār*; but later when twenty-five thousand horsemen came to Jamāl Khān, who was *Mahdawī*, he encouraged the men in the fort, by giving each, one *hamiān* of red gold; and sent out hundred and fifty *Qharīb-ādas* seven *Qharīb*s and twenty *Dakinīs* and one elephant ( *بخت* ), which had the name of Ghulām 'Alī. (the meaning is not at all clear) under his *Khālū* Muhammad Sa'id and Kishwar Khān (it is again not clear whether the men were both maternal uncles of Mīrzā Khān or only one of them, or whether Muḥammad Sa'id was the uncle's name, and Kishwar Khān his title). Col. Briggs does not help in this matter, as he does not mention that Mīrzā Khān sent anybody from the fort to fight with Jamāl Khān's men. Kishwar Khān knew that it was impossible for him to do anything against such terrible odds. Still he came out, and made brave onsets; and he and most of the men perished. It was after this, that Mīrzā Khān ordered the head of Ḥusain NiẒām-ul-mulk to be cut off, and fixed on a lance at the top of a bastion. After this some of the Dakinīs wanted to go back to their own houses; but Jamāl Khān strenuously objected: and he was selected as their leader; and the gate of the fort was set on fire.



Khān Khānān and other men then decided to cut off the head of Husain, and to throw it outside the fort, under a mistaken idea, that their doing so would put an end to the disturbance. They also brought Ismā'il the son of Burhān and placed him on the top of a bastion and raised the royal umbrella over his head. They also proclaimed, that "as Husain was unfit to rule, he had met with his deserts, and Ismā'il Nizām-ul-mulk is now your ruler".

Jamāl Khān and the other *amīrs* seeing Husain's head fought with greater energy; and set fire to the gate of the fort. Although Mīrzā Khān knocked on the door of peace, it had no effect. In the end <sup>1</sup> Mīrzā Khān and his partisans came out of the fort, and took the path of flight. Mīrzā Khān escaped, but Jamshīd Khān and Bhāi Khān and Amīn-ul-mulk and Saiyid Murtaḍa and other leaders were seized and put to death. As Mīrzā Khān was going away towards Junīr, some people recognised him, and seizing him brought him back. By the order of Jamāl Khān, he was torn limb from limb and was put in a cannon, and fired off. The hand of destruction was then raised and of the Irāqīs and Khurāsānīs and Mā-warā-an-nahrīs every one that was seized was slain.

#### Couplets :

With my own eyes I saw, that on the path,  
A small bird struck on the life of an ant;  
But yet its beak had not finished the prey,  
Another bird came and devoured it up.

The women and children were carried away to captivity; and whole families were destroyed. About four thousand innocent persons, who had no connection whatever with the affairs, were murdered. On the whole wherever a man with a white skin was seen, he was killed.

The period of the rule of Husain Nizām-ul-mulk was about <sup>2</sup> two months.

<sup>1</sup> The account of the flight of Mīrzā Khān and his partisans and of the massacre which followed, as given in the text, agrees mainly with that given by Firishtah. There are some differences, but it is not necessary to mention them.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah makes it two months and three days. ~~It is~~ ten months in the text-edition.

AN ACCOUNT OF <sup>1</sup>ISMĀ'IL NIZĀM-UL-MULK, SON OF BURHĀN.

When they <sup>2</sup>desisted from the general massacre, Jamāl Khān raised Ismā'il Nizām-ul-mulk. to the seat of power; and kept him as a puppet or figurehead: and himself carried on the government. Ismā'il in spite of the fact of his <sup>3</sup>youth, perpetrated harsh and cruel acts. They say that he was passing one day through the *bāzār*, and his eye fell on a group of Kashmiris. As he saw that they had white skins, he enquired why they also had not been slain.

In short, Jamāl Khān having acquired complete ascendancy the duty of carrying on the Nizām-ul-mulkī government devolved on him. On account of a dispute which cropped up between the Nizām-ul-mulkī and the 'Ādil Shāhī governments on the border of the two territories, <sup>4</sup>he invaded the 'Ādil Shāhī country, and fought a battle, and was victorious; and three hundred elephants were taken by him as part of the plunder.

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishtah, Ibrāhim the elder brother of Ismā'il was born of a Gulshī mother, and had a dark complexion and an unprepossessing appearance. Ismā'il was a son of a daughter of one of the Nawābats of the Kōhān (Cōncan), and possessed both good qualities and looks. The fact mentioned by Nizām-ul-dīn, about his remark about the Kashmiris, does not show that he possessed the former. According to Firishtah, Jamāl Khān was a *Mahdawī*; and he initiated Ismā'il in the doctrines of that sect. After this, Šalābat Khān, who was imprisoned in the fort of Kehrā on the borders of Berūr, hearing of the murder of Mirān Husain, and being aggrieved at the power of the *Mahdawīs* rose in revolt; but Jamāl Khān defeated him in the neighbourhood of Pattan, and made him retire towards Burhānpūr. He then marched to meet the 'Ādil Shāhī forces, and the two armies met near Āshtī. They confronted each other for fifteen days, after which peace was concluded, on an agreement that Jamāl Khān should send back the *pūlkī* of the mother Mirān Husain Shāh, with seventy thousand *hūns* as *Na'ibāha*. This is what is mentioned in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but Col. Briggs says, that the agreement was, that "Chand Beeby, the widow of Ally Adil Shah, and aunt to the present King of Ahmednuggur, should be sent to the Beejapoor Camp, and the Nizam Shāhī Government should pay two hundred and seventy thousand *hoons* (Nalbahā)" (vol. III, p. 278).

<sup>2</sup> The word is *پرداختند* in one MS. It is *بپرداختند* in the other and in the lith. ed.

<sup>3</sup> The lith. ed. has *خورد سال و*; only *صغر سن* has been adopted in the text-edition.

<sup>4</sup> This invasion and victory took place according to Firishtah at a somewhat later period.

At this time, <sup>1</sup> Burhān, brother of Murtazā Nizām-ul-mulk, who had entered the service of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Hāshī, having heard of the disturbances in the Deccan, came there in the year 997 A.H., in accordance with a *farmān* of the threshold, which was the asylum of all people; and with its help and assistance, he came to

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishtah, Akbar, on hearing of the necessity of Ismā'īl Nizām-ul-mulk, sent for Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk from Bangash, where he had a fief; and offered to send him to the Deccan with an army, so that he might take possession of his ancestral dominions. Burhān said "people would be averse to join me, if I go with a Mughal army; let me go alone to conciliate the people, and bring them over to my side". Akbar agreed to this; and gave him *ḡayyana* Hāndā as a *jāgīr*; and also sent a *farmān* to Rāja 'Alī Khān to help him. Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk sent *ḡaḡnāmas* to the *zamīndārs* of the country of Ahmadnagar. They expressed their willingness to join him. He then marched with a small force by way of Gāndwāna into Berār; but Jahāngīr Khān Jahshī, who had agreed to join him, now turned against him, and met him in battle. Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk was defeated and retired to Hāndā. After this, he obtained the help of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh, and Rāja 'Alī Khān, and came to Burhānpūr; and began to collect troops. Jamāl Khān then consulted with other *Mahdāwīs*; and Sa'yid Anajad-ul-mulk Mahdāwī was made commander of the Berār forces to meet Rāja 'Alī Khān and Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk; and Jamāl Khān himself advanced to meet Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh. He met Dillawar Khān Jahshī, the leader of the 'Ādil Shāhī army at Darsang; and defeated him and seized three hundred elephants. Jamāl Khān was still there, when he heard that the *amīrs* of Berār had submitted to Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk. He then with great pomp and splendour advanced to meet the latter. Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk on the advice of 'Ādil Shāh and Rāja 'Alī Khān, ordered the Marhatta horse to hover about Jamāl Khān's camp and to cut off their supply of grain and fodder. Owing to this, many deserted Jamāl Khān and joined Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk. When Jamāl Khān reached the Rōhangīr Ghāt, he found that Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk's men had blocked it. He attempted to get through by another way, which was very difficult; and his army suffered much from heat and thirst. When they came near a place, where they had hoped to get some water, they found that Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk had already occupied it. At last they found a place where there was a little water; and Jamāl Khān and his partisans resolved to fight at once, after quenching their thirst a little. The battle was fought on the 13th of Rajab 999 A.H.; and Jamāl Khān was about to gain a victory, when he was struck on the forehead by a bullet from a musket, and killed. His partisans fled; but some of them and Ismā'īl Nizām-ul-mulk were seized. Ismā'īl was sent to attend his father Burhān. Col. Briggs says he was confined by his father; and deprived of his throne (vol. III, page 281)



in the Deccan again reached the noble ears, His Majesty summoned Burhān from the country of Bangash; and with much attention and great favour sent him (to the Deccan). A *farmān* to be obeyed by all the world was then issued to all the *amīrs* of the *ṣūba* of Mālwa, and to all *zamīndārs* and more specially to Rāja 'Alī Khān, son of Mubārak Khān, the ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr, that they should take such measures that Burhān, who had come for <sup>1</sup> protection to the threshold, should be placed in the seat of his brother. A noble *farmān* was also sent to Naẓr Bē Uzbek and his sons who had *jāgīrs* in Mālwa. Naẓr Bē and his sons joined Burhān. Rāja 'Alī Khān, considering the service a means of increase in his position and dignity, advanced (to support Burhān). When Jamāl Khān who had gone to Bijāpūr, and defeated 'Ādil Khān and seized the large number of elephants, heard that Rāja 'Alī Khān was advancing, and intended to bring forward Burhān, he marched rapidly from Bijāpūr and arrived with <sup>2</sup> some troops. Rāja 'Alī Khān, who had detached most of the useful of Jamāl Khān's men from him, by means of letters and messages, <sup>3</sup> fought a battle. Men began to desert from Jamāl Khān's army one by one; and the artillery men leaving the guns, etc., unattended to, fled. Jamāl Khān thoroughly amazed at this, exerted himself in spite of the great confusion. At this time one of the musketeers, one of whose relations Jamāl Khān had put to death, <sup>4</sup> fired at the latter, and he fell dead on the battle-field. Rāja 'Alī Khān sent Burhān with great honour and respect to Aḥmadnagar. This event happened in the month of Rajab 999 A.H. He (Burhān) is on the throne of government up to this <sup>5</sup> date.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have the word *که پناه بدرگاه آورده است*; the other MS. substitutes *که التجا بدرگاه آورده است*.

<sup>2</sup> The word cannot be made out. It is *رمکی* and *مکی*, in the MSS., and *مکبی* in the lith. ed. The correct word *کمی* is adopted in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> There are some variations in the readings. One MS. has *اندک*. The other changes *بود* to *بودند* and then says *جنگی*. The lith. ed. agrees with the first MSS., but substitutes *اندکی* for *اندک*.

<sup>4</sup> I have translated the sentence as it is in the MSS. The lith. ed. has *او بجمال خان رسیده باهم در معرکه افتادند*.

<sup>5</sup> This is the end of the history of the Nizām Shāhī dynasty in one of the MSS., and in the lith. ed.; but the other MS. takes the history onward to the

## SECTION III. 'THE DYNASTY OF 'ĀDIL KHĀN.

## AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF YŪSUF 'ĀDIL KHĀN.

2 'Ādil Khān, who was the founder of the dynasty, was a Circassian slave, whom Khwājah Maḥmūd Garjistānī had sold to Maḥmūd Shāh Bahmanī. Garjistān is a dependency of Gilān. 'Ādil Khān became possessed of the country of Shōlāpūr, as far as the river 3 Krishnā, in breadth and length from Dābul to Gulbarga : and proclaimed

year 1012 A.H., which was long after the death of Nizām-ud-dīn. As this is clearly an interpolation by some subsequent scribe, I have not thought it fit to translate it. It may be mentioned, however, that it contains the account of the rules of Ibrāhīm son of Burhān, of Bahādur son of Ibrāhīm, and Ḥusain son of Bahādur. According to Firishtah Ibrāhīm succeeded Burhān. Then Ahmad, son of Shāh Tāhir was set up, but his title was disputed. After that the Mughals stormed Ahmadnagar. Chānd Bibī defended it with courage and intrepidity. The Mughals were repulsed, but Berār was ceded to them. Then Bahādur Shāh's claim was established : and Chānd Bibī became the regent. After three years, Ahmadnagar was annexed to Akbar's dominion ; and Bahādur was sent to Gwāliar as a prisoner. After that Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh II, was set up as king with Parinda as his capital ; but the whole of the power was in the hands of Malik Ahmad.

1 This is the heading in one MS. In the other it is سلسله عادل خان که اول. ایشان یوسف عادل خان است. The heading in the lith. ed. does not mention the dynasty, but simply has ذکر.

2 The words غلامی چرکس بود are taken from the lith. ed. The MSS. omit them. Firishtah gives a long and romantic account of the birth of 'Ādil Khān, from which it appears that he was a son of Aghā Murād (Amurath II), Sultan of Rūm (Constantinople). His elder brother, Muḥammad, on his accession ordered him to be strangled to death, but his mother smuggled him away ; and he was taken to the town of Sawā, where he received a good education. His birth being afterwards divulged, he had to leave Sawā, and ultimately came to India.

Nizām-ud-dīn does not give any account of the events of his reign. Firishtah's account extends over about 13 pages of the lith. ed. and Col. Briggs's translation over about 31 pages. According to Firishtah his rule began in the year 895 A.H. (1489 A.D.) ; and according to another account in 896 A.H. ; and he died in 915 A.H. (1510 A.D.) having ruled for twenty years and two months according to the lith. ed. of Firishtah ; and to twenty-one years according to Col. Briggs's translation. So that what little Nizām-ud-dīn says is incorrect. Mr. Sewell also says that 'Ādil Shāh proclaimed his independence in 1489 (page 106 of his book) ; and he died in 1510 A.D. (page 115).

3 کشتینه Kishtina in the text-edition.

his independence. And in the end he acquired possession of Bijāpūr also, he ruled for seven years from the beginning of the year 906 to the year 913 A.H.

### AN ACCOUNT OF ISMĀ'IL 'ĀDIL KHĀN, SON OF YŪSUF.

<sup>1</sup> (He) sat in his father's place. He was a brave and liberal man. He seized<sup>2</sup> Ankar and Sākar and Naṣratābād and the territory of Ancha; and obtained the title of 'Ādil Khān Sawā'ī. As he had a territory equal to one quarter more than that of any of the other rulers of the Deccan, he got the title of<sup>3</sup> Sawā'ī. He had twelve thousand selected

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishtah Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh appointed on his death-bed Kamāl Khān Dakinī to be the regent; Ismā'il his son being still a minor. The regent gradually usurped all the power; and it was decided at a conference of his creatures, held on the 1st Ṣafar 917 A.H., April 29th, 1511, that on the 1st Rabī'ul-āwwal Ismā'il would be deposed; and Kamāl Khān should have the *Khuṭba* read in his own name. The queen mother then had the regent assassinated by Yūsuf Turk, the foster-father of Ismā'il. After this, Kamāl Khān's mother concealed her son's death, and directed his son Ṣafdar Khān to storm that part of the fort, in which Ismā'il and his family lived. They were panic struck; but Dilshād Āghā, aunt of Ismā'il, who had come recently from Persia incited Ismā'il's attendants to oppose Ṣafdar. Both parties fought bravely, but in the end Ṣafdar, who had been wounded in the eye by an arrow, was killed by a stone being rolled upon him by Ismā'il, from the terrace on which he stood above him. Both Kamāl Khān and Ṣafdar Khān being dead, Ismā'il ascended the throne.

<sup>2</sup> These names are differently written in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. The first appears to be انکبر Ankbar, and اتکیر Atkīr in the MSS., and انکر Ankar in the lith. ed. The second and third are the same in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. The fourth is انچه and الجمه, in the MSS., and انچه in the lith. ed. The first three places are انکیر, ساکر and نصرتا باد, which according to Firishtah had been taken by Amīr Barīd during the lifetime of and in collusion with Kamāl Khān, and were recovered by Mirzā Jahāngīr. Col. Briggs (vol. III, p. 46) calls them Etgeer, Sagar and Noosratabad. انکیر in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> Sawā in Hindūstānī means one and one quarter. I cannot find any reference to the title in Firishtah. It may be that the title had reference to Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh having come from Sawā. See note 2, page 159. The word Sawāī is not in the heading in the MSS., but is in it in the lith. ed. Nizām-ud-dīn does not give any real account of the reign of Ismā'il 'Ādil Shāh. Firishtah's account extends over about thirteen pages of the lith. ed. and Col. Briggs's translation to about forty pages; but I do not think it necessary to

and well-armed and well-equipped horsemen, most of whom were Mughals, in his service, and <sup>1</sup> he looked after them with care. Every year he sent ships to Hurmuz (Ormuz); and summoned men from 'Irāq and K̲h̲nrāsān. <sup>2</sup> They say that one day he was a guest in the house of 'Imūd-ul-mulk Kāwēli. 'Imūd-ul-mulk placed some dishes filled with gems and made a great show of offering them to his guests. When 'Imūd-ul-mulk became a guest of Ismā'il 'Ādil Khān, the latter brought his army fully arrayed before his guest's eyes; and said "This is all that I have acquired; I shall offer to you any one of my servants, whom you may ask for". He carried on three wars with Nizām-ul-mulk; and was victorious each time. He ruled for a period of twenty-five years, and then passed away.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF <sup>3</sup>IBRĀHĪM 'ĀDIL KHĀN, SON OF ISMĀ'IL KHĀN.

Through the exertions of the *amīrs*, he sat in his father's place. Mallū Khān, who was the elder brother applied to Asa'd Khān who

---

refer to any part of these, as it is not necessary to elucidate any of the statements made by Nizām-ud-dīn.

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. have تربیت میکرد, but the lith. ed. has می کرد نگاه داشته تربیت می کرد.

<sup>2</sup> This anecdote is to be found in Firishtah also. The horsemen are described there as *dō-aspa*, i.e., having two horses, riding one and leading the other.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. inserts حکومت before the name. Firishtah has a short section giving an account of the history of Mallū 'Ādil Shāh. It appears that Ismā'il 'Ādil Shāh died on the 16th Šafar 941 A.H. (6th September, 1534 A.D.), while he was besieging Nālkonda on the border of the Tilang country. Col. Briggs calls the fort Kowileconda. Mr. Sewell does not give the name of the fort, but describes it as a fortress belonging to the Qutb Shāhs, see page 166. Ismā'il 'Ādil Shāh's sons immediately began to contend with each other for the succession but Asa'd Khān Lārī, knowing that it would be dangerous for them to fall out in a hostile country, told them that the time was inauspicious for the accession; and that they should return to Gulbarga; and after asking for inspiration from the spirit of Saiyid Muḥammad Gēsū Darāz, select a Sultān. The princes agreed. Asa'd Khān was himself in favour of Ibrāhīm's succession; but as Mallū was the elder brother, and Ismā'il had directed that he should be the successor, Mallū was placed on the throne; and Ibrāhīm was imprisoned in the fortress of Mirich.

Mallū was however utterly unworthy to rule. He was extremely vicious and dissolute; and was deposed after six months, both he and his younger brother Allū Khān being blinded by order of their grandmother.



was the Amīr-ul-umarā. Asa'd Khān raised him to the seat of authority ; and he ruled for half a day (روز یکنیم,<sup>1</sup> which may mean either half a day or a day and half). But Asa'd Khān afterwards repented of what he had done ; and went away to<sup>2</sup> Malkapūr, which was his jāgīr. Mallu Khān was then taken prisoner by Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān ; and he and his younger brother, Ulugh Khān, were blinded by having the pencil drawn across their eyes. They say that he fought nine times with Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk, and was sometimes victorious and was sometimes defeated. He ruled for five and twenty years ; and then passed away.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF 'ALĪ 'ĀDIL KHĀN, SON OF IBRĀHĪM.

In accordance with<sup>3</sup> the directions of his father, he sat in the latter's place. He had two brothers Tahmāsp and Ismā'il. He,

Nizām-ud-dīn says very little about the events of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh's reign, except that he had nine campaigns against Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk. His account is mainly connected with the disputed succession. As regards this also, there are some discrepancies between his account and that of Firishtah. The man whom he called *Asa'd Khān*, *أسعد خان*, is called *Sa'id Khān*, *سعيد خان* by Firishtah. He says nothing about the disputes about the succession having taken place while the rival claimants were in a hostile country, Gōlkonda ; and the statement that Mallū Khān ruled for half a day is of course incorrect. The younger brother of Mallū Khān, who is called *الغ خان*, Ulugh Khān in the MSS. of the *Ṭabaqāt* is called *الف خان*, Aluf Khān in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and Alloo Khan by Col. Briggs (vol. III, p. 77).

Firishtah's account of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh's reign extends to about eight pages of the lith. ed. and to about thirty-three pages of Col. Briggs's translation.

<sup>1</sup> In the text-edition *یک و نیم روز*.

<sup>2</sup> In the text-edition *بالکانو* Balkānu. in place of Malkapūr.

<sup>3</sup> This is not correct. Ibrāhīm, who had contrary to the example of his father and grandfather adopted the *Sunnī* doctrines was displeased with 'Alī, who had shown his preference for the Shi'a faith ; and kept him confined in the fort of Mirich ; and wanted to make his son Tahmāsp his successor ; but he found that the latter had also become a Shi'a and he confined him in another fortress. He left the question of his successor to be decided by God. Muḥammad Kishwar Khān wrote to the Superintendent of Mirich that the death of Ibrāhīm was close at hand ; and he (Kishwar Khān) was proceeding to Mirich to support Shāhzāda 'Alī. As the partisans of Tahmāsp were likely to create a disturbance he should raise the umbrella of rule over the head of

also following <sup>1</sup> the example of his father, had the pencil drawn across the eyes of both of them. He was a man of (good) morals and prepossessing manners, and had the qualities of liberality and patience and generosity. Every year he gave five or six *lakhs* of <sup>2</sup> *hūns* in charity to *faqīrs* and the needy, and travellers from foreign lands. He brought that most learned man of the age, Amīr Fath-ul-lah Shirāzī from Persia, having sent him a large sum of money (to induce him to come to India); and made him his *vakīl*. A large number of the wise men of the age were members of his court. He was a man with the nature of a *darvīsh*, and was a friend of *faqīrs*. He had a great knowledge of the language of the *sufīs*. The greater part of his time was spent in the society and company of wise men. He was also obsessed with outward appearance; and having collected many *amīrs* round him, kept them arrayed in grand dresses. <sup>3</sup> This had a great effect on his affairs. He took possession of the districts of <sup>4</sup> Bāikalā and Bāslār and Bālkōr; and his rule extended beyond that of his ancestors. He waged war three times with Ḥusain Nizām-ul-mulk, and was sometimes victorious and was sometimes vanquished.

He had relations of sincere attachment to the world-protecting threshold of His Majesty the Khālifa'-i-Nāhī. He always made himself mentioned in the sanctified court, by sending petitions and highly befitting tribute. Ḥakīm 'Ain-ul-mulk came once and Ḥakīm 'Alī came a second time on embassy to him from the threshold which was the asylum of all the people. He went forward twelve *karōhs*

'Alī and send him out of the fort, so that they might march together to Bijāpūr. The Superintendent of Mirich, Sikandar Khān, who was a strong partisan of 'Alī agreed to this. Ho was made *sipāh-sālār* (Commander-in-chief); and his son-in-law Kāmil Khān was made an *amīr*. Nobles and people flocked to him from all sides and he was raised to the throne.

<sup>1</sup> The readings are slightly different. The MSS. appear to have بنسبت, برنسبت; and the lith. ed. has بهنسبت. The MSS. appear to be incorrect. I cannot find any mention of the two brothers being blinded in Firishtah.

<sup>2</sup> روپے rupees in text.

<sup>3</sup> The meaning of this is not quite clear.

<sup>4</sup> I have not been able to identify these territories. In the text-edition باوکلا و باسلور و بالکور.

to meet them; and performed the ceremony of submission and allegiance. He inserted the great name of His Majesty the Khalifa 'Ilāhī in the public prayers, and the coins of his realm. He was inclined to the Imāmīa religion; and abandoned the custom of his ancestors.

He heard by accident, that Malik Barid the ruler of Bidar had <sup>1</sup> a very handsome eunuch. He sent letters and demanded the eunuch. Malik Barid evaded (sending him) by pretexts and objections. At last Murtaḍa Nizām-ul-mulk sent an army to attack Barid. The latter shut himself up; and made an appeal for help to 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh. He sent ten thousand horsemen to reinforce Amīr Barid's army; and freed the latter from the siege. This time Malik Barid being helpless and having no other alternatives sent the eunuch. 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh owing to his great <sup>2</sup> passion went out to meet the eunuch, and took him to his palace. At night he took him to a private place and attempted to have intercourse with him. The eunuch drew out a dagger from <sup>3</sup> (ساق shank of) his sock, and stabbed him with it in his chest, and slew him. This strange affair took place in the year 988 A.H.

The period of his rule was twenty-five years. It is a strange coincidence that <sup>4</sup> three 'Ādil Khāns in succession each ruled for twenty-five years.

---

<sup>1</sup> Col. Briggs says (see note, page 142, vol. III, of his history) that "The cause of the King's death is most disgusting and offensive, and it is by no means attempted to be palliated by Ferishta, when he mentions it. A modern author of the history of Beejapoor, however, has set forth reasons in defence of Ally Adil Shah's conduct, and endeavoured to prove that Ferishta has traduced his memory." I have not been able to ascertain the name of the author referred to.

<sup>2</sup> The word is شهوت (Inst) in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; and شوق (curiosity, affection) in the other. In the text-edition شهوتی.

<sup>3</sup> The word is شان in both MSS., شاخ in the lith. ed. and ساق in the text-edition.

<sup>4</sup> This does not appear to be quite correct. Nizām-ud-dīn of course mentions 25 years as the periods of the reigns of Ismā'il 'Ādil Shāh, Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh and 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh; but according to Firishta Ismā'il reigned from 915 A.H. to 941 A.H., about twenty six years. Then Malhī reigned for six months, after which Ibrāhīm reigned from 941-965 A.H., which according to Firishta was a period of twenty-four years and six months; and 'Alī 'Ādil

AN ACCOUNT OF IBRĀHĪM 'ĀDIL KHĀN (SON OF TAHMĀSP),  
WHO WAS A NEPHEW OF 'ALĪ 'ĀDIL KHĀN.

<sup>1</sup> Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān was placed on the seat of government at the age of nine years, by the exertions of Kāmil Khān. Kishwar Khān who

Shāh from 965 to 987 A.H., which only gives twenty-two years; but if the correct date of his death was 988, then he reigned for twenty-three years. Mr. Sewell's table has Ismā'il from 1534 A.D. Mallū or Malū as he calls him from August, 1534 to February, 1535, Ibrāhīm from 1535-1557 A.D. and 'Alī from 1557 to April 11th, 1580 (page 408).

<sup>1</sup> The account of the rise and fall of different ministers or regents agrees generally with that given by Firishtah. According to him Kāmil Khān at first acted with moderation, but after two months he became intoxicated with power, and showed some disrespect to Chānd Bibī; who got Hājī Kishwar Khān to effect his destruction. Hājī Kishwar Khān in his turn tried to grasp the whole power of the state. At this time Bahzād-ul-mulk *varnauba* of Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh advanced with fifteen thousand horsemen, to conquer some of the districts of Bijāpūr lying near the border. Hājī Kishwar Khān sent an army to meet him: and he was signally defeated. There were great rejoicings; and valuable presents were made to the *amīrs*; but later they were directed to return the elephants which had been given to them to the royal *fīlkhāna*. This order, which was passed without consulting Chānd Bibī or Chānd Sulṭān as Firishtah calls her, gave much displeasure; and a conspiracy was made to effect the destruction of Hājī Kishwar Khān; and to raise Muṣṭafa Khān to power. Hājī Kishwar Khān hearing of this got Mīrzā Nūr-ud-dīn Muḥammad, who had received many favours from Muṣṭafa Khān treacherously to assassinate him. Chānd Bibī was highly incensed at this; but Hājī Kishwar Khān got an order from the king for imprisoning her in the fort of Satāra; and she was forced out of the harem with much indignity, and sent to Satāra. After this Hājī Kishwar Khān became very unpopular, and went away to Almadnagar; but he found that the court there could not protect him; so he went away towards Gōlkonda, where he was assassinated soon after by a relative of Muṣṭafa Khān.

After this, according to Firishtah Ikhhlās Khān became the regent; and Chānd Bibī was brought back from Satāra. He, however, being suspicious that Afḍal Khān Shirāzī and Rāsu Pandit, who were associated with him in the government, would prove hostile to him had them put to death. He banished other great *amīrs*; and in conjunction with Ḥamīd Khān and Dilāwar Khān carried on the government according to his own wishes. He then invited 'Ain-ul-mulk from his *jāgīr*; and he and Ḥamīd Khān and Dilāwar Khān went out of the city to meet him. 'Ain-ul-mulk treacherously seized them, put fetters on them and brought them back to the city. On his arrival near the fort he found the gates closed and being panic-struck he went back to his *jāgīr*

was one of the great *amīrs* slew Kāmil Khān, and became himself the *vakīl*. He and Muṣṭafa Khān and the latter's children were then put to death; and the *vakālat* fell to Dilāwar Khān Ḥabshī. He, i.e., Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān abolished the Imāmīa form of the religion; and established the religion of the *sunnat* and *jama'at*. Dilāwar ran the government with great power and strength for nine years. Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān with the help of the other *amīrs* then attacked

---

leaving Ikhlās Khān, Ḥamīd Khān and Dilāwar Khān behind, who then resumed their authority.

Owing to these disorders, the other rulers of the Deccan, viz., Muḥammad Quṭb Shāh, who had succeeded his father and Bahzād-ul-mulk, with Saiyid Murtaḍa the Amīr-ul-umrā of Berār invaded Bijāpūr; and laid siege to Shāhdurd. They were unable to take it, as it was strenuously defended by the *thānūdar* Muḥammad Āqā; and then advanced to Bijāpūr plundering and ravaging the country through which they passed. Ikhlās Khān and the Ḥabshīs attempted to defend Bijāpūr; but being unable to do so, and knowing that their rule was not acceptable to the *amīrs*, represented the fact to Chānd Bibī. She thereupon made Shāh Abul Ḥasan, son of Shāh Ṭāhir the *amīr jumla*. The latter reconciled the nobles; and the enemies finding it difficult to seize the city, retired to their own countries; the Nizām Shāhīs going back to Aḥmadnagar; and Muḥammad Qulī Quṭb Shāh to Gōlkonda; but the latter left Amīr Saiyid Z'ain-ul Astarābādī on whom he conferred the title of Muṣṭafa Khān, to plunder the country. Upon this Ikhlās Khān sent Dilāwar Khān to attack him; and he defeated him signally; and obtained much plunder. From the hour of his victory, the idea of becoming the regent entered the mind of Dilāwar Khān. He returned towards Bijāpūr; and encamped at the town of Alāpūr. He flattered and deceived Ikhlās Khān and then marching rapidly took possession of the citadel. Ikhlās Khān tried to storm it, but was defeated; and his partisans were killed by the cannon fired from the citadel; and he had to retire in the evening. He then nominated Dalīl Khān to besiege the citadel, and he continued the siege for four months; after which he went over to Dilāwar Khān. Ikhlās Khān disdaining to escape was seized in his house; and was blinded and imprisoned.

Dilāwar Khān continued to be the regent till 998 A.H.; when Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh succeeded in wresting the power from him. He effected his escape to Aḥmadnagar. He was induced by Burhān Nizām Shāh to march towards Bijāpūr. After this Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh invited Dilāwar Khān to come back; and the latter did so after receiving an assurance, that he would not be injured in life and property. He was, however, after his arrival, blinded, and was imprisoned in the fortress of Satāra.

This again is a long note but I have thought it proper to write it in order to clear up the accounts of the changes in the regency.

Dilāwar Khān; and the latter fled to Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk at Ahmadnagar. He instigated the latter to march towards Bijāpūr and attack 'Ādil Khān; but he was unable to do anything; and went back. Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān then sent *qaul* (probably an agreement of safe conduct) and summoned Dilāwar Khān; and made him blind by drawing the pencil across his eyes. Up to this day which is in the year 1002 A.H., and which amounts to a period of fourteen years, he (Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān) is ruling his <sup>1</sup> kingdom.

#### SECTION IV. <sup>2</sup>THE QUTB-UL-MULKIYA LINE OR DYNASTY.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN QULI QUTB-UL-MULK <sup>3</sup>HAMADĀNI.

He is from the tribe of 'Mir 'Alī Shahr Āq Qayunli. He was one of the five *razārs* of the Bahmanī Sultāns. As Sultān Maḥmūd

<sup>1</sup> This is the end of the history of the 'Ādil Shāhī dynasty in one MS., and in the lith. ed.; but in the other MS. there is a short interpolation, which says, that Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh reigned altogether for forty-eight years and a few months; and died on the 11th Muharram 1037 A.H.; and that after his death, Sultān Muḥammad 'Ādil Shāh ascended the throne. Firishtah's history of the 'Ādil Shāhī dynasty ends somewhat abruptly with the year 1005 A.H. Col. Briggs in a note on page 188 of vol. III of his history says, "Firishṭa continued to write his history as late as 1612, sixteen years after this period, and probably intended to finish that of Beejapoor last, which can alone account for his leaving off so abruptly".

It may be mentioned that Firishtah's account of this reign is very prolix, and extends over forty-four pages of the lith. ed. It is in more high-flown language than is usual even with him.

<sup>2</sup> This heading occurs in both MSS., but is not to be found in the lith. ed.

<sup>3</sup> The word *است* occurs after *همدانی* in both MSS., but is not in the lith. ed. I do not think it necessary to insert it.

<sup>4</sup> The name is doubtful. It is *شکر اقا* in one MS. and *شکران* in the other. In the lith. ed. it is *میر علی علی شکر اقا قوینلو*. Firishtah however says that a detailed history of the Qutb Shāhī line was written by a man of the name of Shāh Khur Shāh; but he (Firishtah) was unable to get hold of a copy of it. Col. Briggs says that he was able, some years ago, to procure a work entitled the "History of Mahomed Kooly Kootb Shah", written about the time that Firishtah lived. From Col. Briggs's translation of that work the name of the tribe

showed great favour to his slaves. Sultān Qutb sold himself to him, and became one of his slaves. He took possessions of the country of Gōlkonda and ruled for twenty-four years and passed away.

AN ACCOUNT OF JAMSHID QUTB-UL-MULK, SON OF SULTĀN QUTB.

After his father, he sat in the latter's place : and ruled for seven years.

appears to be Ak Koozinloo; so that the correct name of the tribe may be اق كوينلو. It appears however from the quotation of Sultān Qutb's own words in Col. Briggs's work, vol. III, page 340 et seq. that the Sultān belonged to the Kurra Koozinloo tribe, who were subjugated by the Ak Koozinloo tribe; and he fled in his childhood, with his uncle Ameer Alla Koolly; and came to the Deccan. He returned however to Hamadan with his uncle, as he was then too young to remain alone in the country. He came back however later again with his uncle; but the uncle went away; and he remained under the special protection of Sultān Mahmūd Bahmanī. He defended the latter with great gallantry, when he was attacked in the fort of Ahmadsāhād Bidar, and after the campaign against Malik Dinār Hahshi he was made governor of Talangāna. Later he fought bravely in Mahmūd Shāh's campaign against the rebel Bahādur Gilsnī. After the death of Mahmūd Shāh Bahmanī on the 24th Dhi-hijja, 912 A.H., May 12th, 1507 A.D., he with the five other Deccan chiefs, threw off the small portion of allegiance, which they had up to that time owed to the Bahmanī Sultāns. He was killed by Mir Mahmūd Hamadāni, governor of Gōlkonda, when he was sitting down at prayer, at the instigation of his third son Jamshid Qutb Shāh on the 2nd Jamādī-us-sāni 940 A.H., 4th September, 1543. These latter facts are taken from Col. Briggs's account. According to Firishṭah he was killed by a Turki slave in 950 A.H., when he was looking at some jewels. The slave had been instigated by Jamshid Qutb Shāh with the promise of being made a great amīr; but he was slain by Jamshid, immediately after he had slain Sultān Qutb Shāh, so that he might not divulge his complicity in the crime. It is difficult to say exactly how long Qutb Shāh ruled as an independent prince. According to Mr. Sewall's table (p. 410) he reigned for thirty-one years from 1512 to 1543 A.D.

1 It is difficult to find the correct history of this reign. Niẓām-ud-dīn gives no account at all; and the histories given by Firishṭah, and Col. Briggs differ. The former says Shāh Tāhīr was sent by Firishṭah, and Col. Briggs congratulate Jamshid on his accession. Shāh Tāhīr incited him to join Burhān Niẓām Shāh to attack Ibrahim 'Adil Shāh. He accordingly invaded the latter's territory, and built a fort in gurgara Kāknī; and then advanced to attack the fort of Atgar. In the meantime 'Adil Shāh made peace with Niẓām Shāh.

# AN ACCOUNT OF IBRĀHĪM QUTB-UL-MULK, SON OF SULTĀN QULĪ.

After his brother, Ibrāhīm became the ruler of Gōlkonda. He was a man of affairs and of wisdom. But anger and wrath obsessed him.

and Rām Rāj; and Nizām Shāh went back to Aḥmadnagar. 'Ādil Shāh then sent Asa'd Khān Lārī to attack Jamshīd Qutb Shāh. Asa'd Khān Lārī first seized the fort of Kākūl and compelled Jamshīd Qutb Shāh to raise the siege of Atgar. After that Jamshīd Qutb Shāh had several campaigns with Asa'd Khān Lārī, in each of which he was defeated; and in the last of these in a hand to hand fight with Asa'd Khān Lārī, one side of his face was severed off by a blow of his opponent's sword. After that he made peace with 'Ādil Shāh; and conquered some parts of Kachitī. Then he was ill for two years; and now became very savage; and ordered people to be put to death or imprisoned for slight offences. A conspiracy was then formed to depose him, and place one of his brothers on the throne. He received information of this plot; and imprisoned his brothers, Ḥaidar and Ibrāhīm. The former died soon after and the latter went away to Bijānagar. Jamshīd died of a high fever in 957 A.H.

Col. Briggs's account, which is probably derived from the work he got hold of (see note 1, p. 167) is entirely different, except that he agrees in saying that Jamshīd Qutb Shāh died in 957 A.H. I do not, however, consider it necessary to give a summary of his account, as it can be referred to by anybody who is interested in the history.

<sup>1</sup> Nizām-ud-dīn gives no account of the reign of Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh. He only mentions a few of the traits of his character. As far as this goes he agrees with Firishtah; who mentions the same traits, with some more details; for instance Firishtah says that the nails which had been shown to him were the nails of the toes of his victims, which were severed by being beaten with sticks (*tāziyāna*). As regards his servants eating at his table, he says that it was the special servants (*naukarān khūṣa*), who had this privilege. Firishtah also says that he freed Talingāna from highway robbers; so that merchants and wealthy people could travel from place to place in safety.

As regards the history of his reign, Firishtah says that he sought an asylum with Rām Rāj during the reign of Jamshīd Qutb Shāh. After the latter's death, the ministers placed his son, who was an infant of two years of age on the throne; but the Dakinis attacked the palace. Then the ministers determined to send for Ibrāhīm Qutb-ul-mulk; and to place him on the throne. They obtained permission from Rām Rāj for bringing him to Gōlkonda; and when he came to the border of Bijānagar, Muṣṭafa hastened to receive him; and he was made *amīr jumla* or Prime Minister.

After this, he in concert with Ḥusain Nizām Shāh, invaded Bijāpūr in 965 A.H.; and laid siege to Gulburga. But he was afraid of increasing the power of Ḥusain Nizām Shāh; and went back to Gōlkonda; and Ḥusain Nizām Shāh



For a very small offence he inflicted strange punishments on the servants of God. He ordered that the nails of his victims should be severed from their fingers; and should be brought before him in a vessel. Much food was brought, every day, to his table; and it had been so determined that all his servants should eat at his table. He indulged in much ceremony in his meals.

He reigned for five and thirty years.

being unable to carry on the siege alone, retired to Ahmadnagar. Afterwards 'Adil Shāh and Rām Rāj invaded the Nizām Shāhī territory; and at their request, and somewhat against his will Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh joined them; and they laid siege to Ahmadnagar. They were about to take it, when Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh left at midnight; and retired in precipitation to Gōlkonda; and Rām Rāj and 'Adil Shāh had also to raise the siege.

After that Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh asked for the hand of Ḥusain Nizām Shāh's daughter; and at the latter's request he agreed in concert with him to lay siege to Kaliān. There the marriage feast was celebrated and the siege was begun. Then 'Adil Shāh and Rām Rāj and Tufāl Khān and Amīr Barid advanced against them, when Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh retired to Gōlkonda, and Ḥusain Nizām Shāh to Ahmadnagar, hotly pursued by 'Adil Shāh and Rām Rāj. They laid waste both the Ahmadnagar and the Gōlkonda territories; but peace was at last concluded; and Rām Rāj and 'Adil Shāh retired to their own territories. Afterwards Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh summoned Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh to come and aid him in besieging the fort of Dārūr, belonging to 'Adil Shāh; but before he could arrive the fort was taken. He however joined Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh in the invasion of Bijāpūr. 'Adil Shāh now sent to Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh a letter, which Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh had written to him, about acting in concert with him. Nizām Shāh became suspicious of Qutb Shāh's fidelity; and Qutb Shāh retiring in all haste to Gōlkonda, Nizām Shāh looted his camp; and pursued his army, and took much booty and slew large numbers of his men. 'Abd-ul-qādir, the eldest son of Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh then represented to his father, that if he received permission to do so, he would at once attack the Nizām Shāhī army and defeat it. Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh became suspicious of his son's motives; and imprisoned him in a fort, and afterwards caused his death, by giving him a poisoned drink. Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh died in the year 989 A.H. He had ruled for thirty-two years.

Col. Briggs's account (vol. III, p. 390) is slightly different. He has a separate section for Soobhan Kooly Kooth Shah, the infant son of Jamsheed, who, he says, was seven years of age, when he was elevated to the throne. Then as regards Ibrahim Kootb Shah, he says that in the latter part of his reign he conquered some territories in Orissa. According to Col. Briggs, Ibrahim Kootb Shah died on the 21st Rubbee-oos-Sany 988 A.H., 2nd June, 1580. Mr. Sewell (p. 410) has 1581.

## AN ACCOUNT OF MUHAMMAD QULI QUTB-UL-MULK, SON OF IBRAHIM.

Muhammad Quli succeeded his father. He became the lover of a <sup>2</sup> prostitute of the name of Bhāgmatī; and having laid the foundation of a city, called it Bhāgnagar. He had one thousand horsemen, as the retainers of that woman; and they always attended at her stirrups. He is ruling the country up to the present day which is in the year 1002 A.H., and in the 38th year of the Ilāhi era : i.e., for a period of nine years.

<sup>1</sup> Nizām-ud-dīn does not give any account of the events of the reign; and merely refers to a scandalous matter of a more or less personal nature. According to Firishtah Muhammad Qutb Shāh was the eldest and best of the three surviving sons of Jamshīd Qutb Shāh. He succeeded the latter in his twelfth year. He married a daughter of Shāh Mīrzā Ispahānī.

He entered into a treaty with Nizām Shāh, and invaded the Bijāpūr territory, and besieged Shāh Drūg; but being unable to take it, went to Bijāpūr and laid siege to it. They were however unable to take it also, and Muhammad Qutb Shāh was about to retire to Gōlkonda, when the commander of the Nizām Shāhī army, becoming aware of his intention suggested that he should go himself towards Ahmadnagar, laying waste the ‘Adil Shāhī country through which he would pass; and Muhammad Qutb Shāh should proceed to besiege Hasanābād Gulbarga. They accordingly did so; but when Muhammad Qutb Shāh arrived near Hasanābād Gulbarga, he left seven thousand horsemen; and many elephants, under Muṣṭafa Kḥān, to carry on the siege; and himself hastened back to his capital. Muṣṭafa Kḥān laid waste the country round Hasanābād Gulbarga; but Dilāwar Kḥān was sent with a large army from Bijāpūr, and he defeated Muṣṭafa Kḥān who retired in great haste to the borders of Tilang.

After this Firishtah refers to Bhūgmatī, and he also refers to the building of the new city; but he says that it was necessary to do so because Gōlkonda had become extremely unhealthy. He afterwards changed the name of the new city of Haidarābād.

Muhammad Qutb Shāh resolved after this to conquer Dang, by which Firishtah means the country lying between Tilang and Bang or Bengal, i.e., Orissa. He conquered a great part of the country; and the ruler of it, who was called Bābā Balandur fled in great distress to the furthest part of the country.

The above is the history down to 1017 A.H. It is not necessary to go any further, especially as Firishtah says nothing further about the history; but indulges in a description of certain matters connected with the Sulṭān.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. calls her a زن پاتری, the other simply زن, while the lith. ed. has only بهار معنی. In the text-edition the name is پاتری.

## SECTION V. ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF GUJRĀT.

From the beginning of the year 783 to the year 970 A.H., when (Gujrāt) came into the possession of the officers of His Majesty the Khalifa'-i-Ilāhī, which is a period of 187 years, fifteen persons ruled over the country. (These are the) particulars (of them).

Sultān Muḥammad, son of Sultān Muẓaffar, two months and a few days ;

Sultān Muẓaffar <sup>1</sup> Shāh, three years and eight months and twenty days ;

Sultān <sup>2</sup> Aḥmad, thirty-two years and six months and twenty days ;

Sultān Muḥammad, son of Aḥmad, seven years and four months ;

Sultān Qutb-nd-dīn Aḥmad Shāh, seven years and six <sup>3</sup> months and thirteen days ;

Dāūd Shāh, seven days ;

Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh, fifty-five years and eleven months and <sup>4</sup> two days ;

Sultān Muẓaffar, son of Maḥmūd, fourteen years and nine months ;

Sultān Sikandar, two months and sixteen days ;

Sultān Maḥmūd, four months ;

Sultān Bahādur, eleven years and eleven months ;

Sultān Muḥammad Shāh one and half month ;

Sultān Maḥmūd, son of <sup>5</sup> Laṭīf Khān, eighteen years and a few days ;

<sup>1</sup> The word Shāh is in one MS. and in the lith. ed. but not in the other MS. The period is 3 years 8 months and 20 days in one MS., but is 3 years and 8 months and 8 days, in the lith. ed. It may be either 8 or 20 days in the other MS.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. inserts شاة after the name.

<sup>3</sup> The words و سیردة روز which occur in both MSS. are omitted from the lith. ed. I have inserted them.

<sup>4</sup> The words دو روز which occur in one MS. and in the lith. ed. are not to be found in the other MS.

<sup>5</sup> He is called Laṭīf Khān in both MSS., but Laṭīf Shāh in the lith. ed. The period is 18 years in both MSS. and 16 years in the lith. ed. I have adopted the reading in the MSS.

Sultān Aḥmad, three years and a few months ; and  
 Sultān Muẓaffar, son of <sup>1</sup>Maḥmūd, sixteen years and some  
 months.

(AN ACCOUNT OF) AʿẒAM HUMĀYŪN ZAFAR KHĀN.

It is written in books of history, that when the (accounts of the) tyranny of Nizām Mufarrāḥ, who bore the title of <sup>2</sup>Āshtī Khān, and who had the government of Gujrāt in his hands under Sultān Muḥammad, son of Sultān Firūz Shāh, spread over the regions of the world ; and the oppressed who had suffered from his tyranny, and the victims of his cruelty arrived in the capital city of Dehlī from the country of Gujrāt with their complaints ; and narrated tales of his tyranny and oppression before Sultān Muḥammad Shāh ; and spoke the truth of his violence and insubordination, the Sultān after much consideration and great deliberation, conferred the fief of Gujrāt on AʿẒam Humāyūn Zafar Khān, son of Wajīh-ul-mulk, who was one of the great *amirs*, after bestowing many royal favours on him. On the 3rd Rabīʿul-āwwal in the year 783 A.H., he conferred on him a (royal) umbrella, and a red pavilion, which are specially reserved for *bādshāhs*, and granted him permission to go to Gujrāt. Zafar Khān started from the city the same day, and encamped at the royal reservoir (*haud-i-khas*). On the 4th of the month, Sultān Muḥammad hastened to Zafar Khān's camp ; and made his ears heavy with the pearls of advice ; and after again conferring on him a special robe of honour retired to the city.

They say that when the *vazirs* wrote the order of his appointment, they under the orders of the Sultān left the place where the

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has *Shāh* after Maḥmūd, but neither the other MS. nor the lith. ed. has it.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah does not give him the title of Āshtī Khān, but calls him Farḥat-ul-mulk otherwise called Nizām Mufarrāḥ. Firishtah does not speak much of his tyranny, but he says that he had the intention of hostility (to the emperor), and therefore treated the *zamīndārs* and the infidels of the country well, and in order to flatter them, gave currency to the customs of heathenism and idolatry. Therefore the learned and erudite men of Gujrāt sent the letter in which they spoke of Nizām Mufarrāḥ's misdeeds, and prayed the Sultān to take necessary steps for remedying them.

titles (of the new Governor) should have been written, blank; and he (i.e., the Sultān) wrote the titles with his own hand and they were as follows. <sup>1</sup> "My brother, Majlis 'Alī (the noble courtier), the honoured Khān, learned, just, generous, energetic, the most fortunate of the faith and religion, the defender of Islām and Musalmāns, the binder of the *sallanat*, the supporter of the faith,

<sup>1</sup> It is rather difficult to understand these lofty titles and to find equivalents for the high flown epithets. Firishtah who in many places copies the *Tabaqāt* almost *verbatim* gives them as *برادر مجلس علی خان معظم عادل باذل*

مجاهد سعيد الملة والدين ظهور الاسلام و المسلمين عضد السلطنة بمين الملت  
قانع الكفرة و المشركين قانع الفجرة و المتمردين قطب سماء المعالى  
نجم فلک الاعالى صفدر (روز و غا) تهمتن قلمه کشا کشورگیر آصف  
تدبير ضابط امور ناظم مصالح جمهور - ذی الیامن و السعادات صاحب  
الرأى و الکفایات ناشر العدل و الاحسان دستور صاحبقران الغ قتلغ اعظم \*

The antecedents of Zafar Khān are rather curious. It appears from Bayley's History of Gujrat, p. 68, *et seq* that Firōz, who was a great hunter, went out in pursuit of deer one day, and becoming separated from his attendants. He came to a village which was one of the dependencies of Thānēsar. Outside the village he found a party of land-holders seated, and dismounting from his horse, asked one of them to pull off his boots. This man was a master of the science of interpreting signs and appearances. He found on the sole of the Sultān's foot, marks of royalty and the signs of imperial power. The chief men of the village were two brothers Sādhū and Sādhāran. For their caste and genealogy see pp. 67-68. They entertained the guest, and gave their sister, who "was peerless in beauty and loveliness" in *nikāh* to the Sultān. They shortly afterwards became Musalmāns and Sādhāran received the title of Wajih-ul-Mulk. He was the father of Zafar Khān. The Sultān was a disciple of Qutb-ul-aqtāb Hadrat Makhdūm-i-Jahānīn. Sādhū and Sādhāran and Zafar Khān also became his disciples. Zafar Khān did some service to the saint, and the latter in return gave him the country of Gujrat. When he went back to his family, and told them what had happened they said "You are well-stricken in years and if the country of Gujrat falls to thee, what life wilt thou have left to enjoy it". He went back to the saint, and made offerings of perfumes, etc. The saint accepted them, and taking a handful of dates, from a plate which was before him, said "Thy seed like unto these in number shall reign over Gujrat". Some say there were twelve, some say thirteen dates and other say eleven.

When Firōz Khān became the Sultān, he appointed Zafar Khān and his brother Shams Khān to the high position of *sharābdār*. Owing to this they have been described as *kalāls* or distillers.

the exterminator of *kufr* and heresy, the destroyer of the false and the rebellious, the Pole-star of the sky of spirituality, the star of the high heaven, the breaker of the ranks in the day of battle, a fort conquering Rustam, the conqueror of kingdoms, an *Aṣaf* in policy, the regulator of affairs, the director of the rule of people, the master of success and good fortune, the man of wisdom and success, the distributor of justice and beneficence, the *vazīr* of the lord of conjunction *Ulugh Qutlugh Ā'zam Humāyūn Zafar Khān*."

In short (he) travelled towards Gujrāt by successive marches. On the way news came to him that a son had been born to Tātār Khān, his son, who was the *vazīr* of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh; and he had received the name of Alḥmad Khān. Zafar Khān was greatly delighted on hearing this joyful news. He arranged a grand entertainment, and conferred honours and robes on many of the soldiers. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Nāgōr, the men of Kanbāyat came to petition against Nizām Mufarraḥ, praying for justice. Zafar Khān gave them hopes, and advanced towards Nahr-wāla. When he arrived there, which is commonly known as Pattan, he wrote and sent a letter to Malik Nizām Mufarraḥ (in which he said) that it had been mentioned in the august presence of Muḥammad Shāh that Malik Nizām Mufarraḥ had spent the revenue of a number of years of the *khālṣa* lands of the Sultān, for his own needs and purposes, and had not remitted one *dinār* to the treasury. It had likewise (been reported), that he had stretched out his hands for tyranny and oppression, and had greatly harassed the common people living in these places: so that men had repeatedly come to Dehli with supplications and complaints. (He went on to say) that as the reins of binding and loosening of all state affairs of the neighbourhood had been placed in his hands, the better way would be, that whatever might still be left of the revenue of the *khālṣa* lands for those years should be sent with all promptitude, before he went himself; and after comforting and cheering the oppressed, he should himself proceed to the metropolis of Dehli.

---

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah does not say that Zafar Khān wrote to Nizām Mufarraḥ after arriving at Nahrwāla Pattan.

Malik Nizām Mufarraḥ sent a <sup>1</sup> reply to this effect. "You have come a long way, you should remain where you are and should not take the trouble (to advance further). I shall go there and render an account, but on this condition that you will not make me over to custodians." When this reply came and the fact of his rebellion and violence became certain, Ā'zam Humāyūn Zafar Khān began to arrange his army. After a few days news came that Malik Nizām Mufarraḥ had turned towards that country with a large force, and was advancing by successive marches. Ā'zam Humāyūn sallied out of the city of Pattan with his well-equipped army, with the intention to give battle. A great battle was fought on the 7th of Ṣafar in the year 794, in the village of <sup>2</sup> Kānthū which is twelve *karōhs* from Pattan. Malik Nizām Mufarraḥ went about searching for Zafar Khān accompanied by a select body of troops; and he ran about in all directions, like an ordinance of heaven (?). At this time a man belonging to Zafar Khān's army having vanquished him (apparently in single combat) inflicted on him a severe wound, and he fell off from his horse on to the ground. The man immediately <sup>3</sup> cut off his head, and brought it to Zafar Khān.

<sup>4</sup> Couplets:

When Death into his blood plunged his hand,  
 Fate his clear seeing eyes did close.  
 When the key of victory is not in one's hand,  
 He cannot with his arm, the door of victory break.

On seeing what had happened, defeat fell on the army of Nizām Mufarraḥ. Large numbers of men were slain; and much booty fell into the hands (of the victorious army). Zafar Khān went in pursuit

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah also says that the tenor of the reply was what it is described in the text.

<sup>2</sup> The place is called کانبھو Kānbhu and کانتھو Kānthu in the MS. and کانبھ Kānbha in the lith. ed. It is کانتھو Kānthū in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but Col. Briggs calls it Jitpur. Bayley calls it Kambhu. کانپھ in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah's account of the engagement is different. It is figurative and vague. He says that از ضرب آفتاب نصرت و فیروزی از افق بخت ارجمند ظفر خان طلوع نموده نظام مفرح بقصد تحصن بنهروالہ گریخت. It does not mention what happened to Nizām Mufarraḥ after he had fled.

<sup>4</sup> The first couplet is not in the lith. ed., but it is in both the MSS.





and piteousness, and prayed for forgiveness of his offences. Zafar Khān took such tributes from him as he wanted; and advanced towards Sōmnāth.

At this time intelligence came that <sup>1</sup> Malik Naṣir Rāja celebrated as 'Ādil Khān, the ruler of Asīr, had stretched his foot of pride beyond the blanket of his status, and had harassed some of the villages of Nadarbār. A'zam Humāyūn, knowing that the protection of his own territory was more incumbent on him than the capture of the temple of Sōmnāth advanced towards Nadarbār by rapid marches. 'Ādil Khān hearing this news returned to his own country. Zafar Khān also returned to his headquarters at Pattan, after showing kindness to the inhabitants of the country.

In the year 797 A.H., he again mustered his troops, and determined to invade <sup>2</sup> Jar and Tar which are situated to the west of Pattan, and after overrunning some places and getting tributes from the headman of that locality, advanced from there, with the purpose of destroying the temple of Sōmnāth. On the way he made the Rājput's food for his merciless sword; and wherever a temple appeared before his eyes, he raised and destroyed it.

When he arrived at Sōmnāth he burnt the temple down and broke up the idol. He slew the *kāfirs*, and plundered the city. He planned the erection of a *Jāma' masjid*, and having appointed the right men as directed by the *shara'*, and leaving a *thāna* (military post) there, retraced his steps towards Pattan.

In the year 799, news came to A'zam Humāyūn that the Rājput's of <sup>3</sup> Mandalgarh had acquired such power, that the Musalmāns there were abandoning their country and leaving their homes, on account of the injuries caused to them. Zafar Khān collected the

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah describes him as the ancestor of the Farūqī the rulers of Burhānpur.

<sup>2</sup> The names are written as جرتر in one MS. but the جرتر may be a mistake for جرتر which is required having been omitted by mistake. In the other MS. and in the lith. ed. the names are جروتر. Firishtah calls the place جهرند and the ruler of it راي جهرند. In the text-edition it is جروند.

<sup>3</sup> It is Mandalgarh in the MSS. and Karnāl in the lith. ed. Karnāl or Garnāl or Girnār is the same as جونا گڑھ Jūnāgarh. Firishtah also has مندل گڑھ.

army of Gujrāt, and by successive rapid marches traversed the forests and deserts of that country. The Rāja of the place, being proud of the strength of his fortification, occupied himself in defending it. The victorious troops surrounded the hill and the fort, like the centre of a circle, and placed *manjanīqs* (battering ram or catapults) on all sides : and every day a number of Rājput̃s were slain. But as the fort was so strong, that they were unable to accomplish their object, by the help of the catapults, Zafar Khān ordered that *sābāqs* (covered ways) should be planned and completed with all speed. But in spite of these the fort could not be taken. In the end after the siege had lasted for a year and some months, the Rājput̃s in great humility asked for quarter ; and men and women came with bared heads and prayed for safety. They agreed to pay tributes ; and promised that it should be sent every year to Pattan without any demand being made for it. They also agreed, that henceforward they would not cause any kind of injury to the Musalmāns.

A'zam Humāyūn owing to his innate kindness and natural generosity accepted their excuses, and gave them quarter. He took tribute from them, and having fixed the amounts of the annual tribute, and having assured himself about the safety of that territory he hastened to perform a pilgrimage to the holy tomb of the Shaikh of the path of the Faith, <sup>1</sup> Khwājah Mu'in-ud-dīn Ḥasan Sanjarī. He pillaged and plundered the towns in that country and left no trace of cultivation and habitation. After finishing this invasion, he moved to the country known as Dandwāna and having plundered <sup>2</sup> Dīlwāra and Jalwāra took a large number of prisoners and much booty. <sup>3</sup> He returned to Pattan on the 17th of Ramaḍān in the year 800 A.H. As these campaigns had extended over three years, A'zam Humāyūn issued an order that all his troops and soldiery

<sup>1</sup> Of Ajmīr.

<sup>2</sup> Dīlwāra دیلوارہ in one MS. and Dīlwāra and Jalwāra دیلوارہ و جلوارہ in the other and Dandūāna in the lith. ed. Firishtah has Dīlwāra and Jalwāra. He does not mention Dandwāna at all.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah says that it appears from the Tārīkh-i-Alfī that at this time Zafar Khān had the *Khuṣṣa* read in his own name, and assumed the title of Muẓaffar Shāh.

should be exempted from all service and work of all kinds for the period of one year.

Towards the end of the year 800 A.H., Tātār Khān, Zafar Khān's son, who held the office of *razār* of Sultān Muḥammad bin Firūz fled from Dehli owing to the <sup>1</sup> dominance and violence of Mallū Khān, and came to Gujrāt to his father as has been mentioned in the section about Dehli. In short Tātār Khān came in a state of great humility with a prayer to his father that he should be allowed to take the latter's army with him, and have his revenge over <sup>2</sup> Mallū Khān. A'zam Humāyūn Zafar Khān was thinking of collecting troops. But as Mirzā Pir Muḥammad Khān, grandson of His Majesty, the Lord of the auspicious conjunction, Amīr Ṭaimūr Gūrgūn had taken possession of Multān and had seized Sārang Khān, A'zam Humāyūn deferred the carrying out of this determination and the accomplishment of this deed; inasmuch as he had learned by his acumen that Mirzā Pir Muḥammad was the vanguard of His Majesty, the Lord of the auspicious conjunction. It so happened that after a short time, in the year 801 A.H., news came that Amīr Ṭaimūr had arrived in the neighbourhood of Dehli with a large army. Zafar Khān comforted his son, and postponed the march to Dehli for a suitable opportunity.

At this time they (*i.e.*, Zafar Khān and Tātār Khān) advanced together towards Īdar. They arrived by rapid marches and besieged the fort. They sent detachments every day in different directions, and left no stone unturned in plundering and ravaging the country. The Rāja of Īdar in great humility and weakness sent emissaries, and agreed to pay tribute. As the empire of Dehli was at this time full of disturbances and rebellion, Zafar Khān remained satisfied

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah briefly describes the conflicts between Mallū or Iqbāl Khān and Tātār Khān.

<sup>2</sup> He is called بلو اقبال خان in one MS., اقبال خان in the other, while the lith. ed. has only بلو خان. Firishtah does not say that Tātār Khān prayed for the help of his father's army to revenge himself on Mallū or Iqbāl Khān; but he incited his father, Muzaḥfiar Shāh, to march to Dehli, with the object of making himself the *bādshāh*. Muzaḥfiar Shāh agreed, and began to collect troops; but the news came of the advance of Mirzā Pir Muḥammad Khān, grandson of Amīr Ṭaimūr; and upset all their plans.

with the engagement to pay tribute, and returned to Pattan in Ramaḍān of that year. About this time an immense number of people fleeing from Dhlī from the visitation of Amīr Ṭaimūr arrived in Pattan. Aʿzam Humāyūn took pity on their condition, according to their different predicaments, and showed each one of them such kindness as his condition merited. After sometime Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Sultān Muḥammad, son of Sultān Firūz Shāh also fled from the Lord of the happy conjunction : and came to Gujrāt. Zafar Khān did not accord to him the treatment and respect that was due to him, and he becoming hopeless and heart-broken, went away towards Mālwa, as is mentioned in the proper place.

In the year 803 A.H., Aʿzam Humāyūn disbursed a year's pay to his soldiers, and with a large force advanced to conquer Ḍar. When his victorious army surrounded the fort on all sides, and fought battles in succession for some days, the Rāja evacuated the fort, one night, and fled towards Bijūnagar. Early the next morning Zafar Khān entered the fort, offered thanks to God, demolished the temples, left a *thāna* (military post) in the fort, and divided the country of Ḍar among his nobles. After the accomplishment of the necessary work in that country he returned to Pattan. In the year 804 A.H. (they) sent (the news) to Zafar Khān that the Hindūs and *kāfirs* had collected round the temple of Sōmnāth and were exerting themselves to the utmost in reviving their ancient customs. Aʿzam Humāyūn turned his attention in that direction, and sent an army in advance of himself. When the inhabitants of Sōmnāth received information of this, they advanced to meet him by way of the sea, and began a battle. Aʿzam Humāyūn arrived there on wings of speed, and routed and destroyed them. Those who escaped the sword fled, and took shelter in the citadel of the port of Dīp. After a few days the gates of the citadel were opened and the garrison were made food for the sword. He had the chief

---

<sup>1</sup> The reading is obscure ; the MSS. have *هنوز دو کافران* and *هنود و کافران* ; and the lith. ed. has *يهود و کافران*. The word *هنود* appears to be incorrect ; if it was *هنود*, then the meaning would be some Hindūs and infidels. *يهود* in the lith. ed. is of course incorrect. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has *کافران سومنات* i.e., the *kāfirs* of Sōmnāth. He also says that they had overpowered the military post left there by Aʿzam Humāyūn.

men of that body thrown under the feet of elephants. He demolished the temples, and laid the foundation of *Jāmī'* mosque. He appointed *qādis* and *muftis* and other officers directed by the *shara'*; and leaving a military post returned to Pattan, his capital.

In the year 806 A.H., Tātār Khān informed his father A'zam Humāyūn, that Mallū Khān had seized Dehli; and in spite of the fact that Sultān Maḥmūd had rested content with Qanouj, he would not leave him in that condition. He went on to say "If an army be sent with this slave (*i.e.*, he himself) he would advance to Dehli, wrest the city from his possession, and having revenged himself again restore his dominion to Sultān Maḥmūd." A'zam Humāyūn said in reply, "At present there is no one among the descendants of Firūz Shāh, who is capable of carrying on the duties of the empire. Mallū Iqbāl Khān is at present in possession of Dehli, and the learned in the doctrines of the religion do not approve of dissensions and warfare leading to bloodshed among the followers of Islām." Tātār Khān was not satisfied with these words, and said, I have such power now that I can attain to the empire of Dehli. Kingship and empire are not the inheritance of any one; and recited the following couplet:

Couplet:

None can a kingdom and throne acquire,  
That does not seize the sword with both his hands.

When A'zam Humāyūn saw that he (Tātār Khān) was bent on this idea, he relinquished the work of the empire, and made over to him all the army and the paraphernalia of sovereignty.

<sup>1</sup>AN ACCOUNT OF THE ACCESSION OF TĀTĀR KHĀN, SON OF  
A'ZAM HUMĀYŪN ZAFAR KHĀN.

When Zafar Khān <sup>2</sup> voluntarily gave up the duties of the sovereignty, Tātār Khān arranged on the 1st of Jamādi-ul-ākhir 806 A.H.,

---

<sup>1</sup> The heading is given differently in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. It is what I have in the text in one MS. In the other MS., it is the same, but the word جلوس (accession) is omitted. In the lith. ed. it is ذکر. Firishtah has no separate heading.

<sup>2</sup> According to Firishtah Zafar Khān who had assumed the title of Muẓaffar Shāh had acquired such power by the conquest of Idar and Sōmnāth,

a grand entertainment in the town of Asāwal and sat on the throne of empire. He raised the umbrella over his head, and assumed the title of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh. He conferred robes of honour on the *amīrs* and the chiefs and leaders of the country. He distributed the gold that had been scattered as thanks-offering on the umbrella of sovereignty among wise and meritorious men. He conferred the office of *razār* on Shams Khān Dandānī who was the younger brother of A'zam Humāyūn. He ordered that in the heading (*Tughrā*) of the *farmān* the following words should be written. "Al-Muaffaq wal Wāthiq bi-tā'id-ur-Rahmān, iftikhār-ud-dunyā-wad-dīn Abul Ghāzī Muḥammad Shāh bin Muẓaffar Shāh."

After arranging the affairs of the country, he collected a large army, and on the 1st of Sha'bān of the afore-mentioned year, he moved out of the town of Asāwal with the object of conquering Dehli. He was informed while on the march, that the Rāja of Nādōt

---

that he formed the idea of seizing Dehli; and making his son Tātār Khān the emperor, with the title of Ghiās-ud-daula-wad-dīn Sultān Muḥammad Shāh. With this object they were marching along, when at Sānūr Muḥammad Shāh suddenly died.

Firishtah goes on to say that the real facts are, that Tātār Khān rebelled against his father who had become old and weak, at Asāwal; and kept him imprisoned in the fort there. He made his uncle Shams Khān, the *vakīl-us-salṭanat*, and gave himself the title of Nāṣir-ud-dīn Muḥammad Shāh; and then having collected troops advanced to conquer Dehli. Sultān Muẓaffar sent one of his trusted men, and insisted on his brother's arranging for his release, and for the assassination of Muḥammad Shāh. Shams Khān attempted to dissuade him, having no other alternative killed Muḥammad Shāh by giving him poison. Bayley (pages 81, 82) says "It is commonly believed, among the best-informed of the people of Gujarāt, . . . . . that Tātār Khān conspired with certain discontented men, his friends outwardly, his enemies in reality, and placed his father in confinement. He then seated himself on the throne, with the title of Muḥammad Shāh and won over all the officials and army. Afterwards he waged war against the infidels of Nādōt, and subdued them. Then he directed his course towards Dehli, but drank the draught of death, and went to the city of non-existence. The cause of his death was this. In his ambition for the things of this life he threw aside the respect due to a father, a respect which is a lasting blessing to him who pays it; and God Almighty then sowed the seed of vengeance in the heart of his father. Whereupon some of those who were in attendance upon Tātār Khān, but who were personally inclined to Zafar Khān gave him poison."

1 الموفق و الوائق only instead of الوائق in the text-edition.

had placed his feet of pride outside the bounds of obedience and allegiance. He turned his bridle of might from the road, advanced full gallop into the country of Nādōt, and sacked and ravaged villages and towns. He then halted in the town of <sup>1</sup> Saniūr. At this time which was the spring tide of his greatness he suddenly passed away owing to excessive drinking.

Couplet :

To the dust was cast, that flower of greatness, that the  
garden of empire,

With a hundred thousand caresses had in its bosom  
nourished.

The period of his reign was two years and two months and some days. When the dreadful news reached A'zam Humāyūn in the country of Bahrūj he grieved <sup>2</sup> sorely. He arrived very quickly at the camp, and sent Muḥammad Shāh's body to Pattan ; and had his title recognised in the *farmān* as *Khudā-i-gān Shahīd* (the martyred Lord). He showed favour to Shams Khān Dandānī, and transferring Malik Jalāl Kōkhar, made over to him the government and defence of the territory of Nāgōr. Then as there was no help for it he, with a heart broken into a hundred pieces and dazed and stunned mind, occupied himself with the affairs of state. He laid aside the royal umbrella and the throne ; and did not assume any of the insignia of greatness. At last, however, acceding to the prayer of the nobles, and of the pillars of state he again sat on the throne of empire in the year 810 A.H. It has, however, come to (my) notice in various histories that Shams Khān Dandānī gave poison to Muḥammad Shāh in his wine.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF ZAFAR KHĀN WHO HAD THE TITLE OF MUẒAFFAR SHĀH.

When the period of disturbance as regards the imperial power in the country of Gujrāt, which had extended over a period of three

<sup>1</sup> The name is سنڀور in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. ; and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah ; but Col. Briggs calls the place Suintpoor. The invasion of Nādōt and the name of the place where the death took place are not mentioned by Bayley. According to him, Muhammad Shāh died on the march to Dehli. سنڀور Saīnūr in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have عظیم از دودغناک شد ; but the other MS. omits the word عظیم.

years and four months was ended, A'zam Humāyūn Zafar Khān in accordance with the prayer of the nobles and the suggestion of the great and the wise sat on the jewelled throne, in the manner of Sultāns, in the town of <sup>1</sup> Bīrpūr, at the moment which was selected by the astrologers who knew all the stars: and assumed the title of Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh. He was described in the *Khutba* and *farmān* as *Almūthiq bālla-al-manuān Shams-ud-duniā-wad-dīn Abul Mujaḥhid Muẓaffar Shāh*. The gold that was showered in thanks-offering over his umbrella was distributed among meritorious persons. He conferred robes of honour on nobles, and men possessing the knowledge of God and the heads of various groups. He then advanced by successive marches to the country of Mālwa. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Dhār, Sultān Hūshang advanced to give battle, but as he had not the strength to withstand the onset of Muẓaffar Shāh's (army), <sup>2</sup> he fled, and took shelter in the fort of Dhār (but) in the end he came out and saw the Sultān. It had however come to the knowledge of Muẓaffar Shāh that Sultān <sup>3</sup> Hūshang had given poison to his father Dilāwar Khān. As there

<sup>1</sup> The name is Bīrpūr in the MSS., and in Bayley. In the lith. ed. it is بیرپور, Purnūr. It does not appear to be mentioned in the lith. ed. of Firishtah or in Col. Briggs.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah however says that a great battle was fought between the armies of Gujrāt and Mālwa, of which the Rustains and heroes of the world have spoken with the tongue of praise; but the army of Mālwa being defeated Sultān Hūshang was taken prisoner. Col. Briggs also says that Sultān Hūshang was taken prisoner "after a severe action". According to Bayley (page 84) "the brave warriors of Muẓaffar Shāh soon scattered his ranks, as a whirlwind scatters clouds, and he was obliged to fly into the fortress of Dhār".

<sup>3</sup> Bayley quotes the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* as given in "Muhammadan Historians", vol. IV, p. 36, which agrees mainly with the text; and then says that Firishtah's version (which is probably impartial) is one of "Not proven". I have examined the passages about the death of Dilāwar Khān in Firishtah in both the Gujrāt and Mālwa sections, but I do not find anything that justifies the statement that Firishtah's version or verdict is one of not proven. In the section about Gujrāt Firishtah says و چون دلاور خان والی مالو فوت شده بود عوشتنگ شاه قایم مقام او گردید و شهرت یافت که عوشتنگ بطع ملک پدر را زهر داده بکشت. In the section about Mālwa he says منہیان خبر آوردند کہ بشاہ مظفر گجراتی چنین خبر رسید کہ الپ خان پدر خود دلاور خان غوری را بواسطہ حطام دنیوی زہر دادہ خود را



had been affection and fraternal feeling between Dilāwar Khān and Muẓaffar Shāh, (when they were both) in the service of Sultān Muhammad Firūz Shāh. Muẓaffar Shāh put Sultān Hūshang and some of his adherents into prison; and installed his brother <sup>1</sup> Naṣrat Khān in the government of Mālwa.

Intelligence came at this time, that Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqī had come out of Jaunpūr with the idea of seizing Dehli. On hearing this Muẓaffar Shāh started towards Dehli. When Sultān Ibrāhīm knew that Sultān Muẓaffar was coming with the intention of giving battle, he turned back from the way and returned to Jaunpūr: as the pen has narrated in the section about Jaunpūr. Sultān Muẓaffar on hearing this returned from the way and came back to Gujrāt.

He took <sup>2</sup> Sultān Hūshang with him in a state of captivity. (But) after a time the *ra'iyats* and soldiers of Mālwa (aggrieved)

سلاطین مویشنگ نام نهاد. So far as I know Firishtah nowhere adjudicates on the rumour in the one place, or on what he had seen in certain books, in the other.

<sup>1</sup> He had been previously called Shams Khān Dandānī. Bayley appears to me to be unnecessarily puzzled about the identity of Naṣrat Khān. According to the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, Zafar Khān had only one brother, who was called Shams Khān, till the time when he was left as the governor of Mālwa; but at that time he was called Naṣrat Khān without any explanation of the change in his name. Firishtah says the same. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 10) identifies the two names as belonging to one person, where he says "Shums Khan, entitled Noosrut Khan". Bayley spells the name Dandānī as Dindānī and says in a note on p. 95, called "Dindānī from *dandān* teeth". It appears from the text that the man had this name, because some of his front teeth had grown long and projected. If Dandānī is derived from Dandān, I do not see why it should be spelt Dindānī.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah says that Muẓaffar Shāh made over Sultān Hūshang to the custody of his grandson Ahmad Shāh, with the order to keep him imprisoned in a fort. Sultān Hūshang wrote a very humble supplication which Ahmad Shāh showed to his grandfather with a suggestion that Hūshang might be released. As at this time there was a disturbance in Mālwa, Sultān Hūshang was released and after a time the territory of Mālwa with the insignia of royalty was given to him and he was sent with Ahmad Shāh so that the latter might reinstate him in the government. Bayley's version is slightly different. According to him, Alp Khān sent his petition direct to Sultān Muẓaffar and told him that Musa Khān who had been his lieutenant at Mandū had recovered a portion of Mālwa: but if he was released and sent there he would remain his obedient servant all his life. Sultan Muẓaffar then sent him with Ahmad Khan and a large army to expel Musa Khān from Mandū. Musa Khān fled and Sultān Hūshang was then installed in Mandū (p. 85).

at the harsh treatment (accorded to them) by Naṣrat Shāh rebelled against the latter. The <sup>1</sup> *Khawājahdār* rescued him from Dhār, and sent him to Gujrāt. Such of his adherents, as were left behind, were treated with harshness and suffered hardship. The people of Mālwa for fear of offending Sultān Muẓaffar made Mūṣa Khān, who was a relation of Sultān Hūshang their leader and they selected the fort of Mandū for their residence. Sultān Muẓaffar on receiving this news released Sultān Hūshang from imprisonment and sent Shāhzāda Aḥmad Khān, son of Muḥammad Shāh, that he might recover possession of Mālwa, and deliver it over to him. Shāhzāda Aḥmad Khān arrived at Dhār, and taking possession of the country, made it over to Sultān Hūshang; and returned by way of <sup>2</sup> Dahūr to Gujrāt; as the pen forming letters black and fragrant as musk has narrated this clearly and explicitly in the section about Mālwa.

In short, in the year 812, intelligence came to Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh, that the <sup>3</sup> Rājput̃s of Kuhnakōt, one of the dependencies of Kach, had raised the dust of rebellion. Immediately on hearing this news, he detached a large force for their punishment. It is said, that he sent Khudāwand Khān to attend on Shaikh Muḥammad Qāsim Budhū, (asking the latter) to pray that the army of Islām might return with victory and triumph. His reverence the Shaikh on examining the muster roll of the men who had been sent as

<sup>1</sup> I do not know the exact meaning of *Khawājahdār* which is in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. He might have been some kind of a palace official. Neither Bayley nor Firishtah gives any help, for although the former refers to the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī* in this connection, neither says anything as to the way in which Naṣrat Khān retired from Dhār. *Khawājahwār* in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> The name may be دھور or دھور in one MS., and دھود in the other and in the lith. ed. The place is not mentioned by Firishtah or Bayley.

<sup>3</sup> The name of the place is کونہ Kuhnakōt in one MS., and in the lith. ed.; and کونہ Kunthakōt in the other MS. I cannot find any mention of the expedition in Firishtah or in Col. Briggs. It is mentioned in Bayley's History, which is based on the *Mīrāt-i-Iskandarī*, but he places it in 810 A.H., the same year as the expedition to Mālwa; and he calls the place Kambh-kōt, which is very likely the correct name, but he adds a note that the *Tārīkh-i-Alfī* calls the place Kanth-kōt; and he says that Khudāwand Khān was sent in command of the expedition (p. 86).

members of the army, drew his pen across certain names. It so happened that when the army returned under the wing of triumph and victory, every person across whose names the Shaikh had drawn his pen was found to have attained to martyrdom.

In the year 1813 A.H., Sultān Muẓaffar became ill in the city of Nahrwāla Pattan. He placed Shāhzāda Aḥmad Khān on the throne of the empire in the presence of the nobles and chief men of the country; and conferred on him the title of Nāṣir-ud-dīn Aḥmad Shāh. According to his orders, the *Khutba* was read in the prince's name on the pulpits of Islām. Three years and eight months and sixteen days had elapsed on that day since <sup>2</sup> the commencement of his rule. Five months and thirteen days after the accession of Sultān Aḥmad Shāh, he redeemed the pledge of life; and in the month of Ṣafar 814 A.H., he passed from the old caravansarai of the world, to the happy land of a future life. He is buried in the country of Pattan, and he has been styled *Khudā-i-gān Kabīr*.

<sup>1</sup> Bayley (pp. 86, 87) says that according to the *Mirāt-i-Ahmadī*, Sultān Muẓaffar reigned for eighteen years, eight months and fourteen days. He also quotes the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* about the period of his reign and the date of his death; and also quotes the *Tārīkh-i-Alfī*, in explanation of the statement made in the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, though an explanation was scarcely necessary. He also quotes a story from the *Tārīkh-i-Bahādur Shāhī* according to which Ahmad Khān imprisoned Sultān Muẓaffar and gave poison to him, after obtaining an opinion from some learned men, that a son would be justified in killing a man who had killed his father. Sultān Muẓaffar asked him why he was in such a hurry. Ahmad Khān answered him in words of the *Kurān*, "All men have their times appointed, and when the hour is come, they cannot delay or advance it a moment". Bayley after considering the facts given in the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* and the *Tārīkh-i-Alfī*, says that although the story told by the *Tārīkh-i-Bahādur Shāhī* is not absolutely irreconcilable with them, they are at least *prima facie* in conflict with it, and at any rate seem to dispose of the alleged motive of the crime. This is correct, if the haste to grasp the sovereignty be considered to be the motive, but not correct if the desire was to avenge his father's death.

*Firishtah* says nothing about these things. He says that Sultān Muẓaffar became ill at the end of Ṣafar 814 A.H., and died on the 8th of Rabī'-ul-ākhar, i.e., after a month and a few days, and he appointed Aḥmad Khān to be his successor, as he considered him to be abler than his own surviving son. He was 71 years of age at the time of his death.

<sup>2</sup> Since his second accession, after the death of Muḥammad Shāh.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN AHMAD SHĀH, SON OF SULTĀN MUHAMMAD,  
SON OF SULTĀN MUẒAFFAR.

When Sultān Ahmad Shāh reclined on the pillow on the throne of empire and the seat of greatness, he conferred honours on the nobles and the chief men of the kingdom, the great men of the city and the chiefs of various groups; and gave a share of his gifts to all sections of the people. He kept the officers and writers charged with matters connected with the revenue in their former positions; and made great exertions in the matter of increasing the cultivation, and in the building up of the country and the administration of justice.

When the news of the accession of Sultān Ahmad Shāh reached Firūz Khān, son of Sultān MuẒaffar Shāh in the town of Barōda, he owing to his envy and jealousy, raised the standard of revolt and hostility. He conferred the position of *razīr* on Jivan Dās Khattrī. Amīr Mahmūd ʔ Barkī who was the governor of Kunbāyat also joined Firūz Khān. Other *amīrs*, who were wicked by nature, considering Firūz Khān to be a source of profit and success for themselves united with him. They took Firūz Khān to Kunbāyat; and in that town Hāibat Khān, son of Sultān MuẒaffar had an interview with him. After a few days Saʿūdāt Khān and Shēr Khān, sons of Sultān MuẒaffar, came and united with them. Firūz Khān gained strength and power from the union of his brothers, and advanced towards the town of Bahrōj. From that place they wrote a letter to Sultān Hūshang Ghūrī and requested him that he should help them with his spirit and courage; and agreed to pay him a certain number of

---

<sup>1</sup> According to Bayley (p. 88) it was Mōlūd, the son of Firūz Khān, who was governor of Barodah, who raised the rebellion. Firishlah like Niẓām-ud-dīn says that it was Firūz Khān himself. Bayley says in a note that the *Tabaqāt* and Firishlah have Firūz, but the *Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh* has Muʿīd-ud-dīn; and this confirms the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*. Among the rebel's adherents Firishlah has حاکم الملک و ملک شیر و ملک کریم خسرو و جیوند و بیانگداس گنتری. Col. Briggs has two names Jeevundus and Vinaikdas Kunttry, while Bayley has Jivan Dās and Puyūg Dās. The name is جیونداس گنتری in the MSS., and in the lith. ed.

<sup>2</sup> Firishlah calls him Amīr Mahmūd Turk. Barkī seems to be incorrect, though it is found in several places further on, but Turk is also found in a few places.

*lakhs* of *tankās* at each stage, as contribution to his expenses. They also sent to every *zamīndār* that was in the country of Gujrāt, a horse and a robe of honour, to induce him to join them.

When this news reached Ahmad Shāh, he collected his troops, and advanced rapidly towards Bahrōj. When he arrived there, he, in order to extinguish the flames of the disturbance, sent an emissary to the *amīrs*, with the following message :—

Complet :

“ Whom God had exalted, fate will not see abased,  
Who to Him is dear, the world will not see him lowered.

As *Khudā-i-gān Kabīr* (the great Lord), Muẓaffar Shāh took me by the hand, and placed me on the throne of empire, and the foundation of the high mansion, and the strong palace of my empire has been strengthened by the allegiance of the *amīrs* and the well-known men of the country, and of all sections of the people, it is right and proper that you should not place your foot outside the line of loyalty and obedience ; for the result of rebellion is destruction. Each one should be contented with the fiefs, which *Khudā-i-gān Kabīr* Muẓaffar Shāh allotted to him, and should hope for other favours.” When the emissary delivered this message, the *amīrs* consulted among themselves, and sent Haidat Khān who was the uncle of Ahmad Shāh, with him. As Ahmad Shāh lavished great favours on Haidat Khān, Firūz Khān and the other Khāns, becoming assured of safety and favour, hastened to attend on him. The latter cheered each one of them with fresh favours and tried to draw their hearts towards him. He confirmed their old *jāgīrs* ; and after arranging the affairs of that part of the country in the best possible way, arranged to return towards Pattan. At this time news was brought to him that Sultān Hūshang was advancing in that direction from Dhār, with the object of helping Firūz Khān.

Sultān Ahmad immediately on hearing this news left the fort of Bahrōj, and advanced by successive marches to the village of <sup>1</sup>Wantaj. At that place <sup>2</sup>Bhikan Adam Khān Afghān who during

<sup>1</sup> The name is *ونج* and *وسج* in the two MSS., and *شیخ* in the lith. ed. I have not been able to find the name in Firishtah, in Bayley or in the Rās Mūlā.

<sup>2</sup> According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* (Bayley, page 88), the rebels headed by Mūdūd (or Firūz Khān) “defeated Bhikan and Adam Afghān, the king’s men”.

the reign of Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh was the feudatory of Barōda, and at present on account of his hostility (to Sultān Aḥmad), was wandering about, came and attended on Aḥmad Shāh and was received with favour by the latter. As he had now completely settled the matter connected with Firūz Khān, he with perfect calmness, physical and mental, turned to the conflict and warfare with Sultān Hūshang, and sent 'Imād-ul-mulk in advance of himself to engage him. Hūshang in shame and humiliation returned to his own country. 'Imād-ul-mulk pursued him for several stages; and crying the *zaminādhirs* who had joined him brought them with himself to attend on the Sultān.

When Sultān Aḥmad Shāh at the time of his return arrived at the town of Aśāwal and the air (climate) of that place appeared to be congenial to him, he after consulting the omens, and taking the advice of the asylum of all truth, Shaikh Aḥmad Kanbū, may his tomb be sanctified! laid on the ground the first brick for building the great city of Aḥmadābād, which has no equal among the cities of Hindūstān, on the bank of the Sābarmatī, in the month of *Dhīqa'dah* 813 A.H. He laid the foundation of a fort and a *Jāma'* mosque and many markets; and he built 360 *pūras* outside the fortifications, each of which contained a mosque and a *bāzār* and was surrounded by a wall. If, during the time when Aḥmadābād was in a most flourishing condition, some one had said that there was no other city in the whole world which was so grand, and which was so beautifully arranged and decorated, he would not have been guilty of any exaggeration.

---

Bayley (p. 88) says in a note, "the *Tab-i-Akbari* makes these the name of one man, but the probabilities are in favour of the text. Bikm Afghān escaped and rejoined the Sultān". According to the context of the *Ṭabaqāt* the name appears to be that of one man.

In the 18th. ed. of *Firishtah* Ādām Bhankar is said to have been ordered to fight the rebels, and to have been defeated by them, but this is not mentioned by Col. Briggs.

1 دو قلعه two forts in the text-edition appears to be a mistake.

Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān again revolted in the year 840 A.H., at the instigation of <sup>1</sup>Malik Badr 'Alā', who was a very near <sup>2</sup>relation of Muẓaffar Shāh, and again took the path of violence and rebellion; and leaving the central part of the kingdom, took shelter in the hills of Īdar. Sultān Aḥmad Shāh on hearing this news advanced to destroy them; and when he arrived in the town of Wantaj, he sent Fath Khān, son of Sultān Muẓaffar in advance of himself. (But) he also at the instigation of <sup>3</sup>Saiyid Ibrāhīm Nizām the feudatory of the town of Mahrāsa joined his brothers. Sultān Aḥmad on hearing this advanced towards Mahrāsa. Malik Badr 'Alā and Saiyid Ibrāhīm entitled Rukn Khān had a ditch dug around the fort of Mahrāsa; and began to make the necessary arrangements for defending it. Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān summoned Rāimal, the Rāja of Īdar, to help them; and they brought him to a place called Ankhōr, which is five *karōhs* from the town of Mahrāsa.

When Sultān Aḥmad arrived in the vicinity of the town, he first of all sent a body of learned men to Badr 'Alā and Rukn Khān, that they might remove the veil of neglect from before their eyes, and might reveal to them what was right. When the emissaries did not receive such a reply as they had wished for, they came back. The Sultān out of his great mercy sent some other men and by their mouths sent the following messages: "I am giving you assurances of safety, you may go wherever you like." Malik Badr 'Alā and Rukn Khān sent the following reply: "If Nizām-ul-mulk, who is the

<sup>1</sup> Col. Briggs calls him Mullik Dear, but he does not say that he instigated the revolt. It is not clear how he was related to Muẓaffar Shāh. He is described as puzzle-headed in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*. Bayley (p. 93, footnote †) speculates about his relationship with Muẓaffar Shāh but cannot say anything definite about it.

<sup>2</sup> See note 1 above.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah calls him Saiyid Ibrāhīm, who bore the title of Rukn Khān, and was the *jāgīrdār* of Mahrāsa. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 15) says as regards the name of the place, that Firishtah always spells it مهراسه, and so he has also called it Mahrāsa, but the correct name is Mowrasa. The name is spelled مهراسا in the MSS. of the *Ṭabaqāt*, but the lith. ed. has موراसा. Bayley has Mōrāsah. As regards the double name Ibrāhīm Nizām it appears from Bayley, p. 93, that it really means Ibrāhīm the son of Nizām. He was the *jāgīrdār* of Mōrāsah under Sultān Aḥmad, but was induced to join the rebels.

*nā'ib razār*, and Malik Aḥmad 'Azīz who is the *kārguzār* (superintendent) and *nā'ib rakildar* (the deputy *rakīl* in attendance), and Malik Sa'īd-ul-mulk, and Saif Khwājah are sent to us, to take us with them, we would be assured of our safety, and come and attend on you." Sultān Aḥmad gave orders that the noblemen named should go to the gate of the fort, but they should be very careful of the deceit and treachery of Badr 'Ulā, and they should not go into the fort. The above-named *amīrs* then proceeded to the gate of the fort of Mahrāsa. Malik Badr 'Ulā and Rukn Khān kept a body of men in ambuscade; and themselves received the noblemen with courtesy and respect. They then separated Malik Nizām-ul-mulk and Malik Sa'īd-ul-mulk from the other *amīrs*, and engaged them in talk and conversation. At this time the men who were in ambush came out and seized Malik Nizām-ul-mulk and Malik Sa'īd-ul-mulk, and carried them into the fort. Nizām-ul-mulk said in a loud voice, "Go and tell the Sultān that he should not allow any delay in seizing the fort. Whatever fate was allotted to us has overtaken us." Malik Badr 'Ulā put chains round the feet of both of them, and kept them guarded in a dark dungeon. The real reason for such conduct on their part was this, that Malik Badr 'Ulā knew that as long as these *amīrs* should remain in confinement, no injury of any kind would reach the fort.

When Sultān Aḥmad heard what had happened, he gave orders that batteries should be allotted to the different commanders and the fort should be attacked from every side. On the 5th Jamādi-ul-āwwal in the year 814 A.H. (1411 A.D.) the Sultān (in person) attacked the gate of the fort. The brave *amīrs* seeing this jumped into the ditch, and clambered to the fort and in the twinkling of an eye they mounted on the wall; and commenced to take measures for liberating Malik Nizām-ul-mulk. As the moment of the death of those two beloved noblemen had not yet come, they were both brought out, and the rebels were completely routed and destroyed. Malik Badr 'Ulā and Rukn Khān, who were the leaders of the traitors and chiefs of the rebels, were executed. <sup>1</sup> Fīrūz Khān and the Rāja

---

<sup>1</sup> There was apparently two Fīrūz Khāns, (1) Fīrūz Khān, son of Sultān Muẓaffar, and (2) Fīrūz Khān, son of Shams Khān. The former led the revolt against Aḥmad Shāh, and fought with him. Finally however, the Rāja of Idar



of Īdar on hearing of the victory fled and took shelter in the hills of Īdar.

After some days, Ranmal, the Rāja of Īdar, wishing to redress and remedy what had happened behaved treacherously towards Firūz Khān, and having seized his treasures and elephants sent them for the service of Sultān Aḥmad. He also commenced with great humility and submissiveness to send tribute. The Sultān then returned to Aḥmadābād under the wings of triumph and victory. Firūz Khān fled with his brothers, and went to the country of Nāgōr. On the day on which Rāna Mūkul fought with Firūz Khān, the son of Shams Khān Dandānī, Firūz Khān the Shāhzāda attained martyrdom.

In the year 816, <sup>1</sup>Malik Aḥmad Sarkējī, Malik Shāh Malik and Malik Aḥmad son of Shēr Malik, Bhikan Ādam Khān Afghān and Malik 'Isa Sālūr again awakened up the disturbance which had fallen asleep, and they united some of the turbulent *zamīndārs* with them, and overran a part of the country; and every wretched man that was there came and joined them. About this time the Rāja of <sup>2</sup>Mandal, the Rāja of Nādōt and Badhūl

---

behaved treacherously towards him, and he fled to the other Firūz Khān, who had succeeded his father at Nāgōr. Here he was killed according to the Ṭabaqāt in the course of the fight between the other Firūz Khān and Rāna Mūkul. Nizām-ud-dīn calls him Shāhzāda, to distinguish him from his namesake, when mentioning his death. According to Firishtah he went to Nāgōr, and was killed by the *lūkīm* of that place, i.e., either by his namesake, or by some officer of his. As regards Firūz Khān No. 2, it will be remembered, that his father Shams Khān, after being expelled from Dhūr, went to Nāgōr, and became the ruler there. This Firūz Khān was alive long after the death of the other which took place apparently in 815; for it appears that as late as 820 A.H., he sent a message to Sultān Aḥmad, to exculpate himself from all complicity with Sultān Hūshang and his partisans.

Col. Briggs is inclined to think that there was only Feroze Khan, and he was the son of his uncle Shums Khan. See footnote 2, page 19 of vol. IV of his work. According to Bayley it was Mōdūd who fled to Nāgōr, and was killed in a battle between Rānā Mokāl, Rāja of Chitōr and Shams Khān Dīndanī.

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishtah, Sultān Aḥmad invaded Jalwāra in 816 A.H. and it was during his absence that Malik Aḥmad Sark(g)jangī and Shāh Malik, son of Shaikh Malik and Ādam Bhankar raised the revolt. Col. Briggs (p. 17) has Kutchy instead of Sark(g)jangī and he calls Ādam Bhankar of the lith. ed. Adam of Bhukkur. Bayley (p. 95) calls 'Usmān Aḥmad Sarkheji. سرکنجی Sarkanjī in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> Probably Mandalgarh.

sent petitions to Sultān Hūshang, and incited and tempted him to come and conquer Gujrāt. Owing to his foolishness, he put his trust on the help of these rebels and advanced towards Gujrāt. Sultān Aḥmad saw that the dust of disturbance had risen from both sides, sent his own brother Laṭīf <sup>1</sup> Khān, son of Muḥammad Shāh, with Malik Nizām-ul-mulk the *nā'ib vazīr* to punish Malik Shāh Malik, and the other *amīrs*. He himself with a well-equipped army advanced to crush Sultān Hūshang. When he arrived at <sup>2</sup> Bāndhū which is in the neighbourhood of Chāmpānīr, he sent Malik 'Imād-ul-mulk Samarqandī with a large force, in advance of himself. When Sultān Hūshang heard that a slave of Sultān Aḥmad was coming to give him battle, he considered his grandeur higher than that; and returned to his own country. 'Imād-ul-mulk seized a number of the men who were the prime movers and the cause of the disturbance, and brought them before the Sultān. It can, however, be well understood by intelligent men, who know the niceties of things, that Sultān Hūshang was only seeking a pretext for a retreat. It was quite possible for him to send one of his slaves to meet 'Imād-ul-mulk; and he might also have advanced in person, when Sultān Aḥmad advanced to reinforce his own army.

About the time when the news of the retreat of Sultān Hūshang came, fast-moving couriers brought the news that Malik Shāh Malik and the other *amīrs* finding that they had not the strength to meet (the Sultān's army) had fled without waiting to fight. Shāhzāda Laṭīf Khān took up a position after pursuing them for some distance. Shāh Malik in consultation with the other disturbers of the peace, who had combined with him, made a sudden attack in the darkness of the night on the Shāhzāda's camp; but as the soldiers were all present and alert, they could not effect anything. They left a large number dead, and fled and took shelter with the *zamīndār* of Karnāl. The Sultān on receiving this news performed the rites of thanking God, and made the people of Aḥmadābād happy, by his gifts and favours.

---

<sup>1</sup> According to Bayley (p. 96) Prince Latīf Khān had orders to bring Kānhā to account: and the latter was driven into the country of Sōrath.

<sup>2</sup> Bāndhū is called Pāndrū in Bayley, p. 96, and its situation is described as in *pargana Sānouli*, ten miles from the hill of Chāmpānīr.

As the Rāja of <sup>1</sup>Karnāl had given shelter in his territory to Shāh Malik and the other rebels, the Sultān, in the year 817 A.H., determined on punishing him and teaching him a lesson. When he arrived at Karnāl, which is celebrated as Jūnagarh, the Rāja came out, and engaged him in a battle, but in the end he fled and retired into the citadel of Karnāl, and most of his best men fell, and departed to the city of eternity at the time of the flight. Sultān Ahmad besieged the fort; and sent detachments every day for plundering and ravaging the country of <sup>2</sup>Sōrath. After a few days, in the month of Rajab of that year, he seized the fort by an attack in great force. The Rāja, with the others who were concerned in creating disturbance, fled to the top of the hill of Karnāl. Then in great humility and weakness, they came down, and begged for quarter; and again began to pay tribute according to the old custom. Sultān Ahmad left Shāh Abū <sup>3</sup>Khair and Saiyid Qāsim in order to collect the tribute, and returned to Ahmadābād, his capital.

In the year 821, news came that Naṣir, son of <sup>4</sup>ʿAdil Khān the ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr, feeling very proud of his power and greatness had overrun some parts of Sultānpūr and Ndarbār. Immediately on hearing this, (Sultān Ahmad) marched rapidly towards Ndarbār. At the same time he sent a detachment to seize the fort of <sup>5</sup>Tambhōl,

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishlah Sultān Ahmad invaded Karnāl or Carnāl or Gernār because he had heard a great deal in praise of the place, and because the Rāja had never submitted to any Muslimān prince. When he was returning from Karnāl, he demolished a temple at a place called Saiyidpūr, (it is curious that the place should have such a name) which was adorned with various gods and pictures. It appears however from a quotation from a Muhammadan historian, apparently Firishlah, in Forbes's *Ras Mālā*, vol. I, page 329 (1856), that the name of the place where the temple was situated was Somāpūr.

Firishlah also says that Sultān Ahmad sent Malik Tughla, on whom he conferred the title of Tāj-ul-mulk, on a *jeḥād* all over Gujrāt; and the latter slew many, and laid the burden of the *jizyah* and *khirāj* on others, and converted many to Islam. In 819 Sultān Ahmad himself went on a similar expedition.

Firishlah mentions one Hadrat Khān Wali of Dehli coming to Gujrāt, but it does not appear who he was.

<sup>2</sup> سورت in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> Firishlah calls them two brothers, Saiyid Abul Khair and Saiyid Abul Qāsim.

<sup>4</sup> According to Col. Briggs (p. 19), "Tambhōl, a small hill fort in the district of Burhan." This district from its local position naturally belongs to Kutch but it had from a very early period a Rajas independent of that province.

country. It would be right and proper that he also should make himself ready quickly and should come, (in which case) after the conquest of Gujāt the country of Nahrwāda would be conferred on him. As His Majesty is his lord and master, he has thought it right and proper that he should send him notice of this.

Sultān Ahmad, in spite of the rains, marched rapidly and crossing the Nerbada, encamped on the bank of the Mahindri; and when, in the course of a week, he arrived in the vicinity of the town of Mahrāsa, Sultān Hūshang's spies took the news to him, and he sent for and reproached the *zaminbārs*, and after scratching the back of his head, returned to his own country. As Sultān Ahmad had come with only a small retinue, he halted there for a few days for collecting his troops. At this time news came that owing to the disturbances the Rājā of Sōrath had again neglected to pay his tribute; and

---

<sup>1</sup> It was "Naṣr son of 'Adil Khān" a few lines above but it is 'Adil Khān here. The correct name however is Naṣr, son of 'Adil Khān" (see p. 196).

<sup>2</sup> See note 1, pp. 193, 194.

Naṣīr, son of 'Ādil Khān the ruler of Asīr, had in concert with Ghaznīn Khān, son of Sultān Hūshang, besieged the fort of <sup>1</sup>Tālnīr; and had by fraud and deceit taken possession of it; and with the advice and concurrence of the Rāja of Nādōt had invaded the country of Sultānpūr; and had retired after plundering and ravaging it. Sultān Aḥmad immediately on hearing this nominated Maḥmūd Khān with a large

<sup>1</sup> As regards Tālnīr or Thālnīr it appears from a note in page 101 of Bayley's *Gujarāt* that "Thālnīr had been assigned to Iftikhār-ul-mulk (who was Naṣīr Khān's younger brother), by their father, Malik Rāja, the first of the Fārūḡī rulers of Khāndēsh, and with it certain territories, as his inheritance. Naṣīr Khān, who seems to have been restless, ambitious, and unscrupulous, seized the fort from Iftikhār-ul-mulk". Firishtah says it was taken by force, but the *Ṭabaqāt Akbarī* says by stratagem; any way, he got it, and was assisted in doing so, by Ghaznīn Khān, who was his wife's nephew \* \* \* whether their object at first was merely to seize Thālnīr, and the attack on Sultānpūr an after-thought, or whether this was designed from the beginning, the fact was that the two confederates renewed their attempt on these provinces, and, aided by the Rāja of Nādōt (*Ṭabaqāt Akbarī*), for a time carried all before them. On the whole it seems likely that the attack by Sultān Hūshang, the rising in Sūrath, and the second adventure of Naṣīr Khān in Sultānpūr, were concerted movements, and intended to be simultaneous; and, if it had not been for Sultān Aḥmad's prompt march to meet Sultān Hūshang, and the precipitate flight of that irresolute and treacherous prince, Sultān Aḥmad would have had a very serious task on his hand.

This is also confirmed by the *Cambridge History of India*, pp. 296, 297, where however Malik Rāja is called Raja Ahmad, and Iftikhār-ul-mulk is called Hasan. Malik Rāja divided his dominion giving the eastern portion to Naṣīr, and the western to Hasan. Naṣīr founded the city of Burhūnpūr in 1400 A.D. and captured the strong fort of Asīr from a Hindū chieftain: while Hasan established himself at Thālnēr. In 1417 Naṣīr with the help of Hūshang, who had married his sister, captured Thālnēr, and imprisoned Hasan. Then Sultān Aḥmad sent an army which compelled Naṣīr to retire to Asīr, where he was besieged. Peace was made, Naṣīr swearing fealty to Aḥmad and the latter recognising Naṣīr's title of Khān. Hasan retired to Gujarāt, where he and his descendant found a home and intermarried with the royal house.

From the treaty between Sultān Aḥmad and Naṣīr, an estrangement took place between Khāndēsh and Mālwa. Naṣīr resented Hūshang's failure to support him adequately against Sultān Aḥmad. In 1429 in spite of the former enmity between his family and the Bahmanīs, he gave his daughter in marriage to 'Alā-ud-dīn Aḥmad, son of Aḥmad Shāh, the 9th Bahmanī King; but this union engendered strife, and Khāndēsh after a disastrous war with the Bahmanīs, was at length driven into the arms of Gujarāt.

of Bhat and Chāmpāvat and Nādūt and other *zamindārs* came and did homage to him, and prayed for the pardon of their (master's) offences. They also engaged that they would remit double the annual tribute. Sultān Ahmad shut his eyes to the offences of these men; and accepted their overtures. As the Rāja of Mandal continued in his pride and rebellion, and did not try to discontinue his offences, Sultān Ahmad left Malik Nizām-ud-daula to be the regent of the kingdom during his absence, and left the work of punishing the Rāja in his charge; and in spite of the weather, and the narrowness of the road, himself advanced into Mālwa. When by successive marches he arrived in the neighbourhood of the village of <sup>1</sup>Kālūdah, Sultān Hūshang selected some broken land near it, and strengthened his position by having the river of Kālūdah on one side; and having cut down large trees made a *khārband* (a sort of *zariba* made of trunks and branches of trees) in front of him. Sultān Ahmad stood mounted

---

<sup>1</sup> The name looks like Kālāwa كَالَا in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but Col. Briggs has Kūhādā. According to Bayley (p. 103) Kālūdāh is the name of the river on which Ujan is situated.

on an extensive plain. He directed that <sup>1</sup>Amīr Maḥmūd Barkī should command the right wing, and Malik Farīd ‘Imād-ul-mulk the left, while Naṣīr-ud-dīn ‘Add-ud-daula would be in the centre. It so happened that while seated on his horse he examined the battlefield, his attention fell on the circle fixed for Farīd ; and seated there on his horse, he sent a servant to summon him, so that he might confer his father’s title, which was ‘Imād-ul-mulk, on him. The messenger came back (and said) that the Malik had rubbed oil on his body, and he would arrive after a moment. The Sultān said “This is the day of battle. Farīd will find sorrow and shame on account of this delay” ; and without waiting any longer advanced to the battlefield.

When the two *bādshāhs* stood in front of each other, and the two armies met in great excitement and clamour, an elephant belonging to Sultān Aḥmad’s army rushed on Sultān Hūshang’s troops, and caused much havoc ; and scattered the horsemen in all directions. Ghaznīn Khān, son of Sultān Hūshang, coming within bow shot, shot many arrows on the forehead of the animal and wounded and killed it. From all sides warriors thirsting for battle rushed and fell on Sultān Aḥmad’s army ; and there was great distress among the men of Gujrāt. At this time Malik Farīd mounted on his horse and followed by his men came towards the battlefield, but although he tried, <sup>2</sup>he could not find his way into it. At last a man told him, “I know a path by which you can get behind the enemy’s army, and can launch an attack on it”. Malik Farīd knowing the finding

---

<sup>1</sup> Amīr Maḥmūd appears here to be called in one MS. as ترکی Turk. and not as in previous passages برکی Barkī. Firishtah all along calls him Amīr Maḥmūd Turk. Bayley, however, on page 102 calls him Malik Maḥmūd Bargī. As regards Farīd, although he has been called Malik Farīd ‘Imād-ul-mulk, he was the son of ‘Imad-ul-mulk, but that title had not yet been conferred on him ; and the Sultān wanted to confer it on him there and then, as appears from the next sentence.

<sup>2</sup> According to the *Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī* (Bayley, p. 103) Farīd “came to the side of a river, where there was a difficult ford”. After a little while a man pointed out a way to him which led to the rear of Sultān Hoshang’s army.

The battle is mentioned in the *Cambridge History of India*, page 298, as a fiercely contested one, but the name of the place where it took place is not mentioned and no details are given.





himself) has all along been a slave of that threshold, and has always caused himself to be written down as a <sup>1</sup> dependant of Aḥmad Shāh. If owing to his innate generosity he would accept the excuses for the offences of this humble one, the latter would send all his expenses for one year into the treasury, and would pay the annual tribute". As Sultān Aḥmad had at this time another achievement in his mind, he accepted the Rāja's excuses and took the tribute.

In the beginning of Ṣafar of 822 A.H. (1419 A.D.) he advanced towards the town of <sup>2</sup> Sōnkara; and having plundered and ravaged a part of the country round it, he encamped on the 22nd Ṣafar nearer the town; and ordered the erection of a *Jāma'* Mosque there, and appointed the necessary officers directed by the *Shara'*. He marched from that place on the 11th Rabi'-ul-āwwal of that year and encamped at <sup>3</sup> Mānkī, and ordered that a strong fort should be built there as a military post. On the 12th Rabi'-ul-āwwal, he started towards Mandū, and having punished the <sup>4</sup> inhabitants and infidels of the hill of Kāntū, he proceeded along the way by rapid marches. On the way Maulānā Mūsa and <sup>5</sup> 'Alī Hāmid came as emissaries from Sultān

<sup>1</sup> The word is *برسنگبداس* or *نرسنگبداس* in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. I suppose it means a dependant or protegé; or is it only a variant of his name Tirbang Dās.

<sup>2</sup> The name is *سونگہرا* or *سونگہرا* in the MSS., and *سونگر* Sōngar in the lith. ed. Bayley (p. 104) calls it Sōnkherah Bahādurpūr. Firishtah's account differs from that in the text. He says at the end of that year (821 A.H.) Aḥmad Shāh caused the fort of Sōnkara (or Sōngarh) to be repaired and built a mosque there; and then marching towards Andarun (Idar?), and gave orders for plundering and ravaging Mālwa. Col. Briggs's (p. 22) account is similar, but he does not mention the building of the mosque; and he says that Ahmud Shah proceeded in person to Idar, and then sent a detachment into Malwa to lay waste that country. The place is called Songarh, in the Cambridge History of India, page 298; and is said in a note to be at 20°, 11' North and 73°, 36' East.

<sup>3</sup> The name is *ما کنی* or *مانکی* in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. According to Bayley (p. 105) the name of the village is Māknī and it is a dependency of Sōnkherah. It is not mentioned by Firishtah. In the text-edition it is *مانکتی* Mānktī.

<sup>4</sup> They are called the infidels of the hill of Kanthur in Bayley; and are referred to in the Cambridge History of India, page 298, as the "infidels, of the Sūtpūras".

<sup>5</sup> The name is *علي حامد* 'Alī Hāmid in one MS., and *جمادار* Jamādār in the other. It is *علي جامدار* 'Alī Jāmdār in the lith. ed. Firishtah

Hūshang, and prayed, through the intervention of Malik Nizām-ul-mulk the *nā'ib* *vazīr* and Malik Mahmuḍ Tark and Malik Hishm ud-dīn with great submission and humility, that it was not right that a *bādsāh* professing the Islāmic faith should cause injury to the Musalmāns and the helpless people of Mālwa. The Sultan, while

erected in the year <sup>1</sup> 704 A.H. by Alp Khūn Sanjar, the Deputy of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī should be entirely re-built; and having endeavoured to increase the cultivation and the population of the district, gave it the name of Sultānūhād. He again marched in the direction of Chāmpānīr at the end of the year 824 A.H., 1421 A.D. He besieged it and extorted tribute; and on the 19th of Šafar, 825, he advanced towards Sonkhera. He arrived there on the 22nd Šafar, and laid the foundation of another *Jāma' masjid*.

At this time, news came that sometime ago <sup>2</sup> Sultān Hūshang had left Mālwa, and had gone away elsewhere; and had completely

<sup>1</sup> The dates vary in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but as the year of the Christian era in the passage quoted in the preceding note is 1304 A.D., 704 appears to be the correct A.H. year.

<sup>2</sup> As to Sultān Hūshang's disappearance Firishtah's account is, that as he knew that the fort of Mandū was so strong that Sultān Ahmad would not be able to capture it, and he wanted to achieve a feat that people would remember for a long time, he left it in charge of one of his chief officers, and went out himself with six thousand selected horsemen and left it by the Nāgōr gate, while Sultān Ahmad was encamped in front of the Sāraungpūr gate with the object of capturing some fine *mast* elephants in Jājūnagar; and coming back with them. According to Firishtah Sultān Ahmad did not know anything about Sultān Hūshang's departure, or his return, till he heard joy drums beaten, and saw flags hung out from the turrets of the fort of Mandū after he had returned. Apparently the siege was not at all a close one. Firishtah also gives another version from the *Tārīkh-i-Alfi*. According to this, Sultān Hūshang assumed the dress of a horse merchant, and went to Jājūnagar in order to procure elephants. Ahmad Shāh of Gujrāt, having heard that he had left his kingdom, and that his officers had divided it among themselves invaded Mālwa. In the first place he reduced the fort of Mahēswar and then marched to Mandū. I do not consider it necessary to give this version at greater length but I may point out that it agrees generally with the text.

The names of the *jūgirs*, and of the *amīrs* on whom they were conferred, are not mentioned in the quotation from the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, but the collection of the *kharij* revenue is. According to Bayley, page 106, Sultān Hoshang is said to have gone to Jājūnagar elephant hunting; and the people in the fort of Mahēsar having no hope of relief surrendered the keys to Sultān Ahmad.

Bayley discusses at some little length, in a note on page 106, the reason and motives of Sultān Ahmad's attack on Mandū. He thinks that Sultān Ahmad is not likely to have been induced to attack Mandū, a Musalmān country, merely by the absence of Hoshang, with whom he was at peace. He comes to the conclusion that Sultān Ahmad might have been led to believe that Sultān

disappeared. The *amīrs* and the chiefs of the different sections of the people had taken possession of the country, and had divided it among themselves. On hearing this news, the Sultān marched towards Mandū, and advancing by successive marches he laid siege to <sup>1</sup> Mahisra. The *thānadār* prayed for quarter, and entered the service of Aḥmad Shāh. The latter encamped on the 12th Rabī'ul-ākhir at the foot of the fort of Mandū; and sent many detachments to ravage the country. Then when the rainy season approached, he marched from the fort towards Ujjain. He divided the country among his *amīrs*, giving Dipālpūr Banhariā in fief to Malik Mukhlis-ul-mulk, and <sup>2</sup> Kānthā to Malik Farīd 'Imād-ul-mulk, and Mahindpūr which is now celebrated as Muḥammadpūr to Malik Iftikhār-ul-mulk. The *amīrs* sent their officers to the *parganas*; and realised the instalment of the *kharīf* (rainy season crops) revenue.

Sultān Hūshang returned at this time from his journey to <sup>3</sup> Jāj-nagar, where he had gone to buy elephants, a detailed account of this matter is given in the section about Mālwa, and entered the fort of Mandū. After the end of the rains, Sultān Aḥmad went from

---

Hoshang had by some means come to an untimely end; and he himself was as much entitled to the vacant throne as anyone else.

In the Cambridge History of India, page 298, Sultān Hūshang's expedition is called his famous (?) raid into Orissa. I do not think it was a famous raid in any way. It is clear from the account of the expedition given in Firishta that merchants frequently took their goods to Jājnagar from Mālwa, and the neighbouring country for the merchants of that country apparently knew what colour of horses the Rāy had a partiality for, and what merchandise his subjects were likely to buy. It was a whimsical raid certainly, to be undertaken by the ruler of a country which was exposed to attacks by a powerful neighbour.

<sup>1</sup> The name is مهرا in one MS., and in the lith. ed., but کهر in the other MS. Firishta calls it the fort of مهرا. In the quotation from the Tārīkh-i-Alfi it is called Maheswar. It is called Chola Mahēsar in Bayley, page 106. In the text-edition it is مهیر Mahīr.

<sup>2</sup> کانتھا in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> Col. Briggs (p. 22) says that Jainuggur "is a city situated on the Mahanuda river which empties itself into the sea in the province of Orissa. The forests of which have always been famous for wild elephants." There is no city of the name of Jājnagar at present in Orissa; there is a town called Jājpūr, but it is not on the Mahānadi. Probably the name of Jājnagar was given to the province of Orissa. According to *Riyāzu-s-Salāṭīn* (1902), p. 15, Northern Orissa was known as Jainagar.

Ujjain to Mandū on the 20th Rammūlān; and sat down in front of the Delhi gate. He distributed the batteries and laid siege to the <sup>1</sup>hill. He sent a *farmān* to Ahmudābād, to summon <sup>2</sup>Malik Ahmad Ayāz; so that he might bring with him treasure and some appliances. The Malik came on the 12th of Shawwāl; and waited on the Sultān. The latter conferred a robe of honour on him, and made over to him the duty of working the Tārāpūr battery. As on the return of Hūshang, Sultān Ahmad's troops, which had taken possession of the country of Mālwa, and were engaged in managing the *parganas* had again collected together, Sultān Ahmad thought it advisable that he should take up a position in the centre of the country and should send the *amirs* to the towns and *parganas*. According to this decision he marched away from the foot of the fort, and advanced to Sārangpūr. Sultān Hūshang also betook himself to Sārangpūr by a different route. When the Gujrāt army arrived in the neighbourhood of Sārangpūr, Sultān Hūshang sent an emissary, and behaving with great humility and submissiveness agreed to pay tribute. When Sultān Ahmad saw the humility and the weakness of the emissary, he became <sup>3</sup>sure of his safety, and neglected to dig the ditch and to erect the *zariba* round his camp.

The same night, which was the 12th Muḥarram in the year 826 A.H., Sultān Hūshang made a night attack on the camp. As the men were negligent a large number was slain; among them <sup>4</sup>Sāmāt Rāy, Rāja of the country of Dandwāna, who was killed with five

<sup>1</sup> It is <sup>کوه</sup>hill, in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Probably the entire hill on which Mandū was built was besieged.

<sup>2</sup> He is called Muqarrab in the Tārīkh-i-Aḥl. He brought battering rams and engines with him; and he was detached to secure the passage by the Tārāpūr gate, which according to a note by Col. Briggs (p. 21) was the southern entrance.

<sup>3</sup> According to Firishtah the emissaries spoke with such flattery and urgency that Ahmad Shāh neglected not only to dig the ditch and make the thorn fence, but kept no night sentries.

<sup>4</sup> He does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah. Sāmāt Rāy may be a corrupt form of Sāmanta Rāy. He is called Sāmanta Rājput Grāsah of the district of Dandlāh who held the advanced post, in Bayley, page 168. The night attack is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India, but may be one of the "desultory and inconclusive hostilities" mentioned on page 208. In the text-edition the name is سامت راي راجه ولايت دندلا .

hundred Rājput̃s around him. When <sup>1</sup> Sultān Aḥmad woke up he did not find a single person in his pavilion. There were two post horses there. He mounted <sup>2</sup> Malik Jūnā, his *rikābdār* (stirrup holder) on one, and himself mounted the other. Coming out of his suite of tents, he saw the whole camp being destroyed; and not knowing what to do, went away towards the open country. After a little time, he sent Malik Jūnā back to the camp, so that he might make enquiry. When Malik Jūnā again got into the camp, he found that Malik Muqarrab Aḥmad Ayūz, and Malik Farid had got their men together, and were going towards the royal pavilion. They asked him news of the Sultān. Malik Jūnā after ascertaining the real state of things, took the other two with him and went and waited on the Sultān. As the Sultān was "naked" (i.e., probably he had only some kind of night-dress on him), Malik Muqarrab taking off his own arms put them on him. He also asked for leave to attack the enemy. The Sultān ordered "Wait a little while, so that the light of the morning may appear". Malik Jūnā was again sent to the camp, so that he might make further enquiry, and ascertain where Sultān Hūshang was, and how he was occupied.

Malik Jūnā returned, and said, that Sultān Hūshang's troops were busy plundering the camp, and he himself was standing with a few others, with all the royal horses and elephants collected round them. Sultān Aḥmad advanced with the thousand horsemen, who had come with Malik Muqarrab and Malik Farid, at the approach of the dawn, which indeed was a dawn of good fortune, to effect the destruction of Hūshang. When the two forces met face to face, the Sultān with his followers attacked the enemy; and doing all that was demanded of him in the way of activity and bravery, inflicted wounds on Hūshang, and also received a wound himself. Sultān Hūshang also in spite of the wound exerted himself with great bravery. About this time the <sup>3</sup> *ṣilbāns* attached to the Gujrāt army, recognised Sultān

---

<sup>1</sup> He is said to have been awakened by Malik Munīr in Bayley, page 108; but we hear nothing more of this man.

<sup>2</sup> The name of the *rikābdār* is transliterated as Malik Jaunān in Bayley, page 108.

<sup>3</sup> According to Firishtah they were seated on their elephants, which had been seized by Sultān Hūshang.

Aḥmad ; and drove Sultān Hūshang before them ; and although the latter tried to maintain his position, he was unable to do so, and in the end had to flee towards Sārangpūr. The tables were turned now, and the men who had been engaged in looting the Gujrāt camp, became food for the sword ; and all the elephants and horses and camels and war material that had been seized were recovered ; and <sup>1</sup> seven famous elephants, out of those brought from Jājnagar, which Sultān Hūshang had acquired with such great hardship and trouble were obtained as booty. Sultān Aḥmad then with victory and triumph betook himself to his pavilion, and bound up his wound. He then arranged a great public audience ; and did everything to please and encourage the *amīrs* and the heads of groups, and the brave warriors. On the next day, he sent Iftikhār-ul-mulk and Malik Ṣafdar Khān Sultānī, with a well-equipped detachment into the adjoining country, that they might guard the animals belonging to the camp which had been sent out to collect fodder. It so happened that a detachment of the enemy's army had come out of their camp to attack and harass the men who were collecting fodder. The two bodies met and attacked each other, and did everything to slay and be slain. In the end, Sultān Hūshang's detachment fled and retired to Sārangpūr and Malik Iftikhār-ul-mulk and Ṣafdar Khān Sultānī returned crowned with success and victory, and received favours from the Sultān.

Sultān Aḥmad for reasons of state now started for Gujrāt on the 24th of Rabī-ul-ākhir of that year. Sultān Hūshang immediately sallied out of the fort of Sārangpūr, and started in pursuit. Sultān Aḥmad turned back, and stood his ground ; and the flames of battle blazed up between the two armies. Sultān Aḥmad exerted himself with great gallantry. After much fighting and great struggle, Sultān Hūshang turned his back on the field of battle, and fled, and entered the fort. On this occasion also some of the Jājnagar elephants fell into the hands of the Gujrāt army. Sultān Aḥmad halted that day at that place, and on the next day he again advanced in the direction of Aḥmadābād. He arrived there on the 4th Jamādī-ul-

---

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has سلسلة, chain, after هفت, seven ; but the other and the lith. ed. do not have it. Ordinarily an elephant is described as فیل زنجیر. I suppose یک سلسلة فیل also means an elephant.

ākhir of that year ; and held great festive assemblies ; <sup>1</sup> and conferred distinctions on the *amīrs* and the soldiers in the form of reward and robes of honour and increase of emoluments ; and as during this expedition the troops had lost much of their accoutrements, he directed that they should not move for three years. The Sultān took up his residence in Aḥmadābād ; and spent most of his time, in inquiring into the cases of seekers of justice, and regulating the administration of the kingdom and increasing the cultivation.

While he was so engaged the *vazīrs* represented to him that <sup>2</sup> Pūnjā, son of Ranmal, the Rāja of Īdar, had shortened his hand (*i.e.*, had delayed) in remitting the tribute, during the time when the Sultān was engaged in waging war in Mālwa ; and having sent petitions to Sultān Hūshang had tried to combine with him. Accordingly in the year 829 A.H., Sultān Aḥmad sent a well-equipped army to attack Pūnjā. When the army arrived in the country of Īdar, and began to plunder and ravage it, Pūnjā met it with hostility, and placed the shield of resistance before himself. When the struggle was protracted, the Sultān advanced into Īdar in person, and planning the building of the city of Aḥmadnagar, on the bank of the river <sup>3</sup> Hātmatī, at a distance of ten *karōḥs* from Īdar, laid the foundation

<sup>1</sup> There are different readings here. The reading in one MS. which I have accepted is امر و سپاهیان را بانعام و خلعت و زیادتی علوفه امتیاز بخشید ، و چون امر و سپاهیان را که بسیار بیسامان شده بودند خلاص و انعامات کلی داد . The reading in the lith. ed. is manifestly incorrect ; it has امر و سپاهیان را که بسیار بی سامان شده بودند .

<sup>2</sup> The name is written in the MSS. as پونجا ولد رنمل , and in the lith. ed. as پونجا بن راو مانل . He is called Row Poonjā in Rās Mālā, vol. I, page 349. It is difficult to ascertain the derivation or correct Sanskrit form of Pūnjā. It may be Pujya the worshipped, the honoured. Ranmal appears to be Rānā Malla an athlete in war.

<sup>3</sup> The name of the river is Sābarmatī in the MSS., in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and in the text-edition ; but it is Hātmatī in the lith. ed. Col. Briggs (vol. IV. p. 26) says, "Ferishta writes Hatmutty ; it should evidently be Saburmutty, the same river that flows to Aḥmadabad". In the map before me Aḥmadnagar is not on the Sābarmatī, but on a stream which flows into it some distance to the south near a place which is called Cairah in the map. So I have retained Hātmatī.



of a fort there. He made very great exertions in completing the building of it. He sent out detachments from Aḥmadnagar, in different directions, all round Īdar; so that they might burn *tar o khushk* or wet and dry, *i.e.*, growing crops, houses, etc.; and slay all that fell into their hands. Pūnjā, although he saw all this, was determined to carry on the war. He sometimes appeared suddenly from a distance before a detachment which went to escort the men who went for fodder; and in the meantime, whenever he accidentally got a chance, he launched an attack.

In the end, when he found that he could effect nothing, and could not endure any longer the onslaughts of Aḥmad Shāh's armies, he sent representatives, and with sincerity offered to pay a large tribute. But as he had (before this) several times broken his engagements, the Sultān did not accept his offer. He advanced in person against Īdar, and on the first day he seized three forts. Pūnjā fled and took shelter in the hills of <sup>1</sup>Visālnagar. The next day the Sultān sacked the city of Īdar and returned to Aḥmadnagar. As the construction of Aḥmadnagar was now completed, the Sultān in the following year, namely 830 A.H., again turned the bridle of his spirit to the conquest of the territory of Īdar, and sent his troops in all directions, so that they might plunder and ravage the country; and he himself also gave his attention to the work. Pūnjā in a state of great humility and distress sent emissaries and knocked at the door of peace; and agreed to pay a heavy tribute. As the Sultān had now formed a kingly determination to destroy him completely, he showed no favour to the words of the emissaries. Pūnjā, now utterly despondent, hovered moth-like round his territory; and wherever he could, made an onslaught. On a Thursday<sup>2</sup> in the month of Jamādī-ul-ākhir in the year 831 A.H., he came upon a detachment, which had gone to the jungle to escort a body of men who had gone to bring grass. After exerting himself a great deal against them, he fled; but when

<sup>1</sup> It is Bijānagar in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but the correct name appears to me to be Visālnagar, but I find that the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* also calls it Bijānagar. The reading in the MSS. is followed in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> So in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but *Firishtah* who has copied the sentence from the text *verbatim* has پنجشنبه, 5th, instead of پنجشنبه, Thursday, and this is apparently correct.

he was galloping away, an elephant which had become separated from the detachment came into his view. He immediately turned round, and wounding the animal with his spear, drove it before him. As some brave men pursued him, he betook himself into some uneven ground where there were caverns and ravines; and by an accident, his horse shied at the elephant and <sup>1</sup> threw him into a cavern. Ahmad Shāh's soldiers came up and turned the elephant back; but they did not know that Pūnjā had been thrown by his horse. About this time a poor man entered the cavern in order to collect fire-wood. He saw a well-dressed man lying dead; and from his appearance concluded that it must be the corpse of a great man. He cut off his head and waited with it upon the Sultān; and many people recognised it to be the head of Pūnjā. They say that a man at that time saluted the head and showed great respect towards it. When people asked him the reason of this, he said, "I served him for a long time". Sultān Ahmad was pleased with the man's good manners, and rewarded him.

Complet :

Neglect not good manners, and their results great;  
For in the end, they will your fortune make.

The next day the Sultān advanced to Īdar, and sending troops gave them orders to devastate Īdar and Visālnagar. <sup>2</sup> Har Rāy, the son of Pūnjā, having through the intervention of <sup>3</sup> Khān Jahān Sultānī begged for the pardon of his offences; and engaged to pay an annual tribute of three *lakhs* of silver *tankas*. Sultān Ahmad, on account of his great generosity and humanity, drew the pen of

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have افند, but the other MS. has انداخت. I have accepted the latter reading, for it does not appear that the dead horse was found near Pūnjā's corpse. The circumstances under which Pūnjā was killed are given somewhat differently by Firishlah. Col. Briggs does not say anything about the manner of his death. According to Rās Mālā, vol. I, p. 349, Pūnjā fell under his horse and was killed.

<sup>2</sup> So in the MS. and in the lith. ed. Firishlah (lith. ed.) has پیراو, Pirān. Col. Briggs does not give his name; while the Rās Mālā has Naron Das. Bayley (p. 112) calls him Hīr Rāi; but says he is called Har Rāo in some MSS. He is called Harī Rāi in the Cambridge History of India, page 298, and is said to have been reduced to vassalage by Sultān Ahmad in 1428.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has Khān Jahān Sultānī, and this is followed.

forgiveness across his offences; and took him into the circle of his loyal adherents. He conferred the title of *Ṣafdar-ul-mulk* on Malik Ḥasan and left him with a large body of troops in charge of the military post of Aḥmadnagar. He then trampled over and plundered the country of <sup>1</sup> Kilwāra, and went to Aḥmadabad. He made the citizens fortunate with rewards and favours. After some days, Malik Muqarrab gave letters, addressed to Har Rāy, to some of his personal adherents, for the payment of their wages. When these men arrived at Īdar Har Rāy made delays in the payment of the money and passed the time making evasions. He then got the news that the Sultān had come out of the city, and was engaged in collecting troops. In great fear he fled and took shelter in an out-of-the-way place. When this news reached the Sultān he <sup>2</sup> advanced on the wings of speed on the 4th Ṣafar, 832 A.H.; and on the 6th Ṣafar, he took up his residence in the fort, and after performing the rites of offering thanks to God, planned the erection of a *jāma' masjid*, and leaving a large force there went to Aḥmadnagar.

<sup>3</sup> In 833 A.H., when <sup>4</sup> Rāja Kānhā, the Rāja of Jhālāwār, knew that Sultān Aḥmad had nearly finished the matter of Īdar; and that

<sup>1</sup> So in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. *Firishtah* (lith. ed.) has كنگوارہ, Kankwāra. Col. Briggs has Gilwara and Rās Mālā has Gudwārā.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of the peaceful march to, and entry into Īdar, described in the text, *Firishtah* says یکی از قلاع معتبر آید مفتوح ساخته بقله در آمد, and Rās Mālā, vol. I, p. 350, follows him and says "he carried by storm one of the principal forts in that province, wherein he built a magnificent mosque".

<sup>3</sup> Bayley says (page 114), that for some reason, the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* gives only a brief summary of the latter years of Sultān Aḥmad's reign; and he has supplied the deficiency by extracts from the *Tabakāt-i-Akbarī*. As regards the war between Sultān Aḥmad of Gujārāt and Sultān Aḥmad Bahmanī no additional information can be obtained from the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*.

<sup>4</sup> So in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* he is changed to two Rājas راجہ جالوارہ Rāja Kānhā and Rāja of Jālwarāh, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 26) has Kanha Ray, the Raja of Jhalode. According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* his proper name was Kānhā Satarsūl, Rāja of Jhālāwār. He had joined the rebellion of 1413 and had therefore good reason for being afraid of Sultān Aḥmad's displeasure towards him. The rebellion of Kānhā is also mentioned in the *Cambridge History of India*, page 296, where it is said that it called "Aḥmad into Kāthiāwār".

as soon as he would be free, he would attack other *zamīndārs*, he considered that it would be most advantageous for him to leave his own country; and he accordingly fled. The force, which was deputed to punish him, went in pursuit of him into the territory of Asīr and Burhānpūr. Naṣir Khān, the ruler of Asīr, on account of the fact that Kānḥā had presented <sup>1</sup> two worn-out elephants as tribute to him, and <sup>2</sup> exchanging the rights for benefits conferred, for injuries, gave him a place (i.e., an asylum) in his kingdom. After some days, Kānḥā went to Gulbarga <sup>3</sup> and brought a force from Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī to assist and help him; after which he plundered and ravaged parts of Nadarbār.

When this news reached Sultān Ahmad, he appointed his eldest son, Shāh-zāda Muḥammad Khān to inquire into and redress this matter; and sent great *sardārs*, such as Saiyid Abul Khair, and <sup>4</sup> Saiyid Qāsim, son of Saiyid 'Ālam, and Malik Muqarrab Ahmad Ayāz, and Malik Ifrikhūr-ul-mulk with him. Shāh-zāda Muḥammad Khān fought a battle with the Dakinī troops, and gained the victory; and a large number of the Dakinīs were slain, and others were taken prisoners. The remainder who escaped the sword fled to Daulātūbād. When this intelligence reached Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī, he sent his eldest son, Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, and his second son, Khūn Juhūn, to carry on the war with Shāh-zāda Muḥammad. He also entrusted the

<sup>1</sup> The MS. has دو نیل لکات مفکوک, the other has دو نیل لکات. The lith. ed. has دو نیل رکار. Firishlah has دو نیل لکات مفکوک. Col. Briggs says (vol. IV, pp. 26, 27) Kānḥā presented two elephants which he had succeeded in bringing with him, when he escaped from a detachment, which was sent in pursuit of him. Bayley (p. 116) in his translation of the Tabakāt has two large elephants, but says in a note, some MSS. have "one".

<sup>2</sup> The sentence in the text حقوق تربیت بمعقود عدل ساخته is obscure and cryptic. Firishlah is more intelligible. He says او باستظهار قربانی بادشاهان و دکن حقوق تربیت سلطان گجرات بمعقود مبدل ساخته, i.e., and he (i.e., Naṣir Khān) relying on the strength (he felt) from the fact of his relationship with the hādshāhs of the Dakin, exchanged the rights, which the Sultān of Gujrāt had on him for benefits he had conferred, for injuries.

<sup>3</sup> Firishlah says specially that it was a small detachment.

<sup>4</sup> The names are somewhat different in the lith. ed. of Firishlah. Saiyid Qāsim is called Saiyid Abul Qāsim. Saiyid 'Ālam is not mentioned as the father of Saiyid Qāsim, but as a separate chief.

affairs of the army to the judgment of Qadr Khān, who was one of the great *amīrs* of the Deccan. Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, in consultation with Qadr Khān, arrived by successive marches at Daulatābād; and took up his residence there. At this station, Naṣir Khān, the ruler of Asīr and Burhānpūr, and Kānhā Rāja of Jhālāwār also joined the camp of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn; and he was much strengthened by them. Muḥammad Khān also advanced towards Daulatābād with the intention of giving battle. When the two armies approached each other closely, Muḥammad Khān arrayed his ranks, and the fire of <sup>1</sup> battle flamed up from both sides. At this juncture Malik Muqarrab Aḥmad Āyāz and Qadr Khān, both of whom were commanders, fought hand to hand. Qadr Khān fell from the back of his horse on the dust of destruction. Malik Iftikhār-ul-mulk seized a large elephant as booty. Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn fled and took shelter in the fort of Daulatābād. Naṣir Khān, the ruler of Asīr, also fled, and went to the hills of <sup>2</sup> Kaland, which are situated in the country of Asīr. Muḥammad Khān carried out the customs of offering thanks to God, and as he knew that it would be impossible to capture the fort of Daulatābād, he returned from there; and having trampled down a part of the territory of Asīr and Burhānpūr, took up his quarters in the town of Nadarbār. From that place he notified the true state of things to his father. Sultān Aḥmad wrote in reply that he should continue for a few days longer at Nadarbār, in order to arrange and regulate the affairs of that quarter.

In the year 834 A.H. <sup>3</sup> Quṭb, the officer-in-charge of the island of Mahāim, and other sufferers (*mehnat zadhā*) sent a petition to

<sup>1</sup> This battle is said, in the Cambridge History of India, page 299, to have taken place at Mānikpunj about 38 miles N.-W. of Daulatābād.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has گولکند, Gōlkund, which is clearly a mistake. The other has کلند, Kaland. The lith. ed. has کلید, Kalīd. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has Kaland. Col. Briggs simplifies matters by saying (vol. II, p. 28) "took refuge in the hills of Kandoish".

<sup>3</sup> He is called Quṭb without any addition, in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Col. Briggs, however, calls him Kootb Khan. Firishtah's account, however, differs from that in the text inasmuch as he says that it was after the death of Quṭb, that Aḥmad Shāh Bahmanī, who was always thinking of retaliating for his previous defeat, sent the Malik-ut-tujjār, and the latter took possession of the island. In the Tārīkh-i-Alfi Quṭb is called Rūi



ut-tujjār had cut down large trees, and had built a barricade with the branches along the shore of Mahāim. When the Gujrāt army came up, Malik-ut-tujjār came outside the barricade and fought with gallantry. From the approach of the light of dawn to the setting of the sun, the brave men of the two armies showed no deficiency in courage and hardihood. But in the end, Malik-ut-tujjār fled and got within the barricade. When the ships arrived, and the Gujrāt army had the command both by sea and land, Malik-ut-tujjār sent a petition to Sultān Aḥmad Bahmanī and prayed for help. The Sultān sent ten thousand horsemen, and <sup>1</sup> sixty and odd *mast* elephants with two of his sons from Daulatābād, and sent his *vazīr* Khān Jahān with them, so that they might act according to his advice and counsel. When the Deccan army arrived near Mahāim, Malik-ut-tujjār being assured of the safety of the island and of the barricades of trees, had the honour of waiting on the two Shāhzādas. After much discussion, it was decided, that they should in the first instance endeavour to recover possession of the district of Thāna; and they started in the direction of that place.

Shāhzāda Zafar Khān also made necessary preparations, and started to re-inforce the men at Thāna. After the two armies had met (near Thāna), they fought with each other from morning till sun-set; and in the end, defeat fell on the Deccan army. Malik-ut-tujjār fled to <sup>2</sup> Jālna; and his troops, for fear of their lives, abandoned the island of Mahāim. Zafar Khān crowned with success and victory landed there; and sent out ships, and seized some of the officers of Malik-ut-tujjār, who had fled by way of the sea. He despatched some boats after <sup>3</sup> filling them with various kinds of rich fabrics and

<sup>1</sup> Both MSS. have شصت و چند, sixty and odd. The lith. ed. has شصت sixty. Bayley, p. 117, has sixty odd, but Firishtah has شصت و چند sixty and odd, Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 29) has sixty.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS., the lith. ed. have جالنه. Bayley, p. 118, has Jālnah. Firishtah has چاکنه, (which does not differ very much from جالنه) but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 30) says, he fled to Chakun.

<sup>3</sup> The passage is somewhat obscure. The MSS. and the lith. ed. have از اقسام اقمشه و تنگهای بار چند کشتی پر کرده. Bayley, p. 118, has translated the passage, "Several ships were loaded with stuffs and clothes and precious stones". Firishtah has رقصه و زر سرخ. Col. Briggs has "Some beautiful gold and silver-embroidered muslins". Rās Mālū has the words as Col. Briggs, and puts them





news arrived that Sultān Aḥmad Bahmanī had again besieged the fort of <sup>1</sup> Tambōl; and Malik Sa'adat Sultānī was leaving nothing undone in bravely defending it. Immediately on receipt of this news, he turned back, and advanced on wings of speed towards Tambōl. When Sultān Aḥmad Bahmanī became aware of this fact, he cheered and encouraged a body of *pāiks*, with robes of honour and great rewards; and told them, "Reinforcements are coming to the garrison. If to-night <sup>2</sup> you will play a great game, so that the hand of my hope should reach the skirts of success, I shall give you such rewards, that you will never again be in want". When a part of the night had passed, the *pāiks* went to the foot of the fort, and slowly and silently under the shelter of the rocks, climbed to the top of the rampart and dropped into the fort. They wanted to open the gates; but Malik Sa'adat Sultānī, being on the alert, fell upon them; and slew most of them. Those who escaped the sword threw themselves from the ramparts and perished. Malik Sa'adat Sultānī did not consider this sufficient; but opening the gate, he made a sudden attack on a battery which was in front of it. The men in the battery, who were asleep, were most of them wounded.

At this time the Sultān of Gujrāt approached near; and Sultān Aḥmad Bahmanī leaving the foot of the fort, advanced to meet him. He summoned his *amīrs* and the commanders of his army and told them, "The armies of Gujrāt have several times defeated the armies of the Deccan; and they have also taken possession of Mahāim. If this time also, I show inactivity and am defeated, I shall lose the Deccan altogether". He then arrayed the ranks of his army, and took up a position on the battlefield. Sultān Aḥmad Gujrātī also came, and met him with his armies arranged for battle; and there was a

<sup>1</sup> Called Batnol in the Cambridge History of India, page 299.

<sup>2</sup> The words are somewhat obscure. The MSS. have نقشی یافتید, and the lith. ed. has نقشی یافتید. The lith. ed. of Firishtah in the corresponding passage also has نقشی یافتید. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 31) calls the *pāiks* "Naigs", but he does not translate the Shah's words to them. Bayley has *pāiks*, and he says immediate action is necessary; but it is not clear what meaning he has given to the words in question. I have adopted نقشی یافتید, while the text-edition has نقشی باختید.

(It appears in my mind) that in the *Tārīkh-i-Bahmannī* the story of the siege of the fort of Tāmbōl has been narrated in a different way, from what my double-tongued pen has described, in the section about the Dakin. (It may be said here) in brief that as the period of the siege was protracted to two years Sulṭān Aḥmad Shāh Gujrātī,

---

<sup>4</sup> The name is Dhāid in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. and also in Bayley's translation; but Firsiroti says that it was **آزدر خان**, Azhdar Khān, who challenged the Gujrāt amīr, and Col. Briggs calls him "Ajdur Khan, a young Deccany nobleman" (vol. IV, p. 31).

<sup>5</sup> **قمانبر** instead of **تالنبیر** in the text-edition.

<sup>6</sup> The MSS. have **کرد و تاراچ** but the lith. ed. has **دھات و تاراچ**. Firsiroti who copies the *Ṭabaqāt* frequently word for word has in the corresponding passage **نمود و تاراچ نمود**. This last version appears to me to be the best, but I have retained the words of the MSS. **کرد و تاراچ** without conjunction **و** in the text-edition.

<sup>7</sup> The reading in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. which is **ملک تاج الدین را** **انجا ماند** appears to me to be incomplete. I would insert some words like **فرمود کہ** or **تعیین کرد کہ** between **داد** and **انجا ماند**.

<sup>8</sup> The word is **قصید** and **قصہ** in the two MSS., and **قصہ** in the lith. ed. Firsiroti has **قصہ** in the corresponding passage and this is followed in the text-edition.

in the way of kindness and friendship, sent an ambassador to wait upon Sultān Aḥmad Bahmanī; and made a request through him, that this fort might be left in his possession. Sultān Aḥmad Bahmanī did not accept this proposal. In the end, Sultān Aḥmad Gujrātī marched straight from the boundary of his kingdom and invaded the Deccan, in order to have his revenge; and commenced to plunder and ravage it; and Sultān Aḥmad Bahmanī had no further opportunity for besieging it. It appears to my mind, that the author of the *Tārīkh-i-Bahmanī* has not narrated the facts in a plain, straightforward manner; and what is narrated in the history of Gujrāt is nearer the truth.

In the month of Rajab in the year 836 A.H. (1432 A.D.), the Sultān advanced to conquer the countries of <sup>1</sup> Mewār and Nāgōr; and when he arrived in the town of <sup>2</sup> Harpūr, he sent his troops and plundered and ravaged the towns and villages; and he levelled to the dust any temple that came anywhere into his view. After some days, he encamped in the town of Dūngarpūr; and <sup>3</sup> Ganēsā, the Rāja of the place fled; but later feeling ashamed and repentant, came and waited on the Sultān; and becoming enlisted in the band of his defendants, paid a suitable tribute. Sultān Aḥmad Shāh then trampled down and ravaged the country of Kīlwāra; and then invaded Dīlwāra, and having rased to the dark ground the palaces and other structures of <sup>4</sup> Rānā Mūkul, the Rāja of Dīlwāra, which had lifted up their

<sup>1</sup> In the translation of this part of the *Tabakāt*, given in Bayley, p. 120, the name of Kōliwārah is inserted after Mewār and Nāgōr. *Firishtah* in the lith. ed. has *ميوات و ناگور*; and Col. Briggs also has towards Nagoor and Mewat. *Mēwāt* seems to be a mistake for *Mēwār*. *Rās Mālā* says, he marched into Rajpootana.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. have *برپور* Barpūr and *هر پور* Harpūr; the lith. ed. has *سبز پور* Sabzpūr; and Bayley, p. 120, has Sidhpur. *Firishtah* does not mention the place, and at once takes Sultān Aḥmad to Dūngarpūr.

<sup>3</sup> The name is *کنیسای* in the MSS., and *کنیسای* in the lith. ed. Bayley has Ganesā. *Firishtah* does not mention any name, but says the Sultān extorted tribute from the *zamīndārs* of the place. Col. Briggs has Raja, and *Rās Mālā* has Rāwul. *کنیا* in the text-edition.

<sup>4</sup> With reference to Rānā Mūkul the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* has *ولایت کیلوارہ* ولایت کیلوارہ. Col. Briggs paraphrases Kīlwāra and Dīlwāra as the country of the Kolies and Bheels. *Rās Mālā* has "the country of the Bheels".

heads to the sky (with pride), demolished the temples and destroyed the idols. He also had some turbulent men who had fallen into his hands, executed, <sup>1</sup> by throwing them under the feet of elephants. He left Malik Mir Sultānī in those places for the purpose of collecting *khirāj* (tribute); and turned to the country of the Rāthōrs. The <sup>2</sup> Rāthōr chiefs offered him allegiance, and paid tribute, and behaved with loyalty. <sup>3</sup> Firūz Khān, the son of Shams Khān Dūdānī, and the nephew of Sultān Muzaffar, who was the ruler of Nāgōr came and waited upon the Sultān, and brought some *lakhs* of *tankas* as tribute. <sup>4</sup> Sultān Ahmad gave back the tribute; and leaving a body of troops in certain *maḥāls* of Mawās, in the way of a military outpost, returned to Ahmadābād. As on every occasion when the Sultān returned from journeys and wars, he held grand festive assemblies, and conferred distinctions on each of the *amīrs* and other soldiers, who had performed commendable services, by the grant of rewards and favours and increase in their stipends and promotions in their ranks, and also granted kingly favours on all the inhabitants of the country of Gujrāt, both great and small, and Shaikhs and deserving persons, on this occasion also he arranged a similar festive assembly; and conferred new favours on every deserving person.

In the year 839 A.H., news came from the country of Mālwa, that Maḥmūd Khān, the son of Malik Maghīth, who had been the *vazīr* of Sultān Hūshang, had murdered Ghaznī Khān, the Shāh-zāda, who had, after the death of Sultān Hūshang, succeeded him, by giving poison to him; and having raised the standard of his own rule had taken the name

<sup>1</sup> I do not exactly understand the words which I have translated by throwing them, etc. They are *بی سپر فیلان گردانید* in the MSS. and *بی سپر فیلان گردانید* in the lith. ed. Firishtah has no corresponding passage.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of Rāthōr chiefs, Firishtah in the lith. ed. has *و چون بولایت میوات و لقبه و باز بابلاد و لانی رفت و از ما رایان باج و خراج گرفت*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p.32) has "the rays of Kota, Boondi and Nowlaya", and Rās Mālū (p. 351) has the Rows of Kotah Boondi and Nudoolaye.

<sup>3</sup> This is also mentioned by Firishtah and also by Col. Briggs; but neither of them says anything about the leaving of the military outpost in certain Maḥāls of Mawās.

<sup>4</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 299, mentions the question of an indemnity from Firūz Khān, but does not say that it was given back to him.

of Sultān Maḥmūd. At the same time, Masa'ūd Khān, the Shāhzāda of Mālwa, fled from his own country, and came (to Sultān Aḥmad) for protection. The Sultān advanced with a well-equipped army, and <sup>1</sup> took possession of the greater part of the country of Mālwa; and intended to place Shāhzāda Masa'ūd Khān on the throne of his great ancestors. At this time, by a strange mischance, a great pestilence made its appearance in Sultān Aḥmad's army, so that people had no time for placing the dead into shrouds, and for burying them. In the course of two days some thousands of people died; and the Sultān himself having been attacked, had against his wishes to return to Gujrāt. He gave hopes of being able to help Masa'ūd Khān in the course of the next year. The particulars of this brief statement have been narrated in greater detail in the section about Mālwa.

Fate did not give a further lease of life to Sultān Aḥmad; and he passed away on the <sup>2</sup> 4th of Rabī'ul-ākhir in the year 846 A.H. (4th July 1443 A.D.). He was born in the metropolitan city of Dehli on the night of Friday the 19th of Dhī-ḥijjah in the year 793 A.H.; and this has been referred to on a preceding page. <sup>3</sup> They say that from the time of his attaining to majority, till the time of his death, he had never omitted to perform the prescribed religious duties. He

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah narrates the different operations of the campaign, and it appears from what he says that Sultān Aḥmad was not so successful as Niẓām-ud-dīn wants to make out. In fact according to Firishtah, Sultān Maḥmūd (the usurper) was well able to withstand the Gujrāt forces, as well as those raised by 'Umar Khān, a son of Sultān Hūshang. It appears from Firishtah that there was famine in the Gujrāt camp before the plague broke out, while Sultān Maḥmūd was well provided with food and ammunition. As to the plague (وبا) Firishtah says that it rarely occurs in India (ووبا که در هندوستان کمتر باشد). Col. Briggs has a note about this (p. 34, vol. IV), the meaning of which is not quite clear to me. The Cambridge History of India, page 299, calls Maḥmūd Khaljī a cousin of Ghaznī Khān.

<sup>2</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 300, gives August 16th, 1442, as the date of his death.

<sup>3</sup> There are some differences in the readings. One MS. has after هرگز طریقہ بادشاه پسندیده اطوار و مائل بطاعت بود, از وقضا نشد مدفون گشت. The other MS. omits the sentence from بادشاه to بود. The lith. ed. has after گویند بادشاه پسندیده و نیک کردار بود. I have adopted the reading of the first MS.

was a *bādshāh* of agreeable manners, just and god-fearing. He attained to sovereignty in his 22nd year and he ruled his kingdom for 32 years and six months and twenty days. He was buried in the centre of Aḥmadābād. After his death he has been mentioned in letters and *farmāns*, as *Khudāigān Maḡhfūr* (the pardoned Lord).

AN ACCOUNT OF GHĪYAS-UD-DUNIYĀ-WAD-DĪN MUḤAMMAD  
SHĀH, SON OF AḤMAD SHĀH.

When <sup>1</sup> two or three days' mourning was over, the *amīrs* and the *razīrs*, and the great men of the city, and the well-known men of the kingdom placed Shāh-zāda Muḥammad Kḥān on the throne of the empire <sup>2</sup> on the 7th of Rabi'-ul-ākhir, in the year 846 A.H. (7th July 1443 A.D.); and gave him the title of Ghīyās-ud-duniyā-wad-dīn Muḥammad Shāh. The ceremonies of offering presents and thank offerings were carried out. The gold that was showered over the royal umbrella was distributed among the meritorious people. The Sultān conferred distinctions on the *amīrs*, and the great men of the kingdom, by conferring titles and high appointments on them. From the time of his accession the kingdom gained a new grandeur and greater splendour. He opened his hands with such liberality, that the common people gave him the name of Muḥammad Shāh <sup>3</sup> *Zarbakḥsh*, i.e., the giver of gold. On the 20th Ramaḍān, in the year 849 A.H., Muḥammad Shāh had a son born to him, and the prince

<sup>1</sup> In the text-edition ۳۰ و three days only is adopted.

<sup>2</sup> The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* (Bayley, page 125) gives 845 A.H., as the year of the accession of Muḥammad Shāh; but his coin (see Thomas, *Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Dehli*, page 353) gives the name and title as it is given in the text; and the date of the accession as the 3rd Rabi'-ul-ākhir, 846. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* (Bayley, p. 129) gives him credit for his liberality, but says he gave himself up to pleasure and ease, but the capacity of his understanding did not attain to the lofty heights of the concerns of the state.

<sup>3</sup> There is a very great difference between the accounts of this reign as given by Nizām-ud-dīn and by Firishtah respectively. According to the latter, it was in the year of the accession, and not after three years, that Muḥammad Shāh invaded Idar, and espoused the Rāy's daughter. According to Bayley (p. 129) the version in the *Ṭabakāt* is probably correct. The *Cambridge History of India*, page 300, says, Muḥammad Shāh was surnamed *karīm* or the Generous. This is scarcely correct. He was popularly called *Zarbakḥsh*, and after his death he was called *Khudāigān Karīm*.

received the name of Maḥmūd Khān. The Sultān gave grand entertainments, and conferred rewards and favours on the *amīrs* and the great men of the kingdom.

After the time of the entertainments was over, in the same year he advanced to the country of Īdar, in order to devastate it; and he did not omit a single *minutia* in the practices of plunder and rapine.

<sup>1</sup> Rāy Har, son of Pūnjā, Rāja of Īdar, came forward in great distress, and brought his daughter in the shape of tribute. That lady owing to her great beauty kept Muḥammad Shāh bound to her by her personal charm. After some days she prayed that the fort of Īdar might be bestowed on her father. The Sultān gave the fort of Īdar to Har Rāy; and advanced towards the country of <sup>2</sup> Bākūr; and Ganēsā, the Rāja of Dūngarpūr, fled and concealed himself in the caverns in the <sup>3</sup> hilly country. When he saw that the country was suffering from the ravages of calamities, he came out; and through the intervention of <sup>4</sup> Malik Mīr Sultānī, who had the title of Khān Jahān did homage to the Sultān, and having paid tribute kept his kingdom in safety. From that place Sultān Muḥammad Shāh returned to Aḥmadābād. <sup>5</sup> He advanced in the year 853 A.H., (1449 A.D.), to

<sup>1</sup> The Cambridge History of India here calls the son of Pūnjā, Raja Bīr, though on page 298 it had called him Harī Rāi. Earlier, Har Rāy (*vide* p. 211).

<sup>2</sup> It is written as باکر in the MSS., and is so printed in the lith. ed. Firishtah does not mention the place. Bayley (p. 130) has Būgar. According to the Cambridge History of India, page 300, "Muhammad next attacked at Bāgor, Rānū Kūmbhā of Mewār, who fled and took refuge with the Rāwal of Dūngarpur, the chief of his house, but afterwards appeared before the invader, and purchased peace with a heavy indemnity". This does not agree with the text, according to which it was Ganēsā of Dūngarpūr, (and not Kūmbhā of Mewār) who paid the tribute. In the text-edition the name of the King is کنیا.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. inserts کوہستان و جنگل after.

<sup>4</sup> ملک منیر in the text-edition.

<sup>5</sup> I have already noted that there is considerable difference between the accounts of this reign as given by Nizām-ud-dīn and by Firishtah. According to the latter the expedition to Chāmpūnīr took place in 954 A.H. and not in 953 A.H. The Rāja of Chāmpūnīr is called کنگداس, Kangdūs in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and Gangadas by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 35). The Cambridge History of India, page 301, calls him Gangādūs, but the name can only be transliterated as Kankdūs, Kangdūs, or Gangdūs and not as Gangādūs. He is said after the

conquer the fort of Chāmpānīr; and when by successive marches he arrived in its neighbourhood, Rāy Kank Dās, the Rāja, sallied out of the fort with his men; and fought bravely; but in the end, he fled and re-entered the fort. Sultān Muḥammad blockaded the fort from all sides; and employed all his energy in capturing it. Rāy Kank Dās sought the intervention of Sultān Maḥmūd K̲haljī and asking him to his aid, agreed to pay a *lakh* of *tankas*, at every stage, as a contribution towards his expenses. Sultān Maḥmūd K̲haljī being tempted by the money, advanced to help and support him. When he arrived in the town of Dahūd Sultān Muḥammad, rising from the foot of the fort

---

battle to have been driven into the hill fortress of Pavagarh (?) Pavangar, the fort of the winds. Then as regards the invasion of Sultān Maḥmūd K̲haljī, Firishtah says that as soon as Sultān Muḥammad heard of it, he set fire to his surplus tents and other equipages, because many of the beasts of burden in his camp had perished on account of hard work; and there was also a certain amount of faint-heartedness; and commenced to retire. And although his *amīrs* incited him to carry on the war, he did not agree, and retired with precipitation towards Almadābād. Then when the Sultān of Mālwa again advanced with a hundred thousand men to conquer Gujrāt, Sultān Muḥammad could not be induced by his *amīrs* to fight against him; and in fact wanted to flee to Dīp. Then the *amīrs* went to his wife, and asked her whether she wanted that her husband should live or that Gujrāt should be lost to the dynasty. The queen had to agree; and the *amīrs* gave him poison in his food; and he was killed on the 7th of Muharram 855 A.H.

His reign, according to Firishtah extended to eight years and nine months, and fourteen days. Col. Briggs (vol. IV. p. 36) reduces the period of his reign by ten days; and says in a note that according to the Moontukhib-oot-Towareekh, he died on the 10th Muharram A.H. 855, 12th February, 1451.

Bayley (p. 132) says that the Sultān asked the advice of a *bakāl* or grain dealer; and the latter advised him to place his treasures and family on board ships; and amuse himself with fishing. The Sultān accepted this advice and commenced secretly to make his preparations; but Sāid 'Alā-ul-lah, one of the great nobles came to know of this, and asked the *bakāl* why he gave such advice. The man replied that as the Sultān did not ask the advice of the *amīrs*, but of a man like him, he gave him such advice as he considered best. Then Sāid 'Alā-ul-lah told the King's son, what his father intended to do; and asked him what he would do if he was in his father's place. The prince said, he would fight for his kingdom and if necessary die on the battlefield. Then poison was given to Sultān Muḥamad (pp. 133, 134).

The Cambridge History of India, page 301, says nothing about poison being given to the Sultān: and says he died on the 10th February 1451.



retired towards Aḥmadābad. He halted in the village of <sup>1</sup> Kothrah, and busied himself with the mustering of troops, and the collection of materials of war and of the arms and weapons of offence. Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji also stopped at the place where he had arrived, and did not advance any further.

In the month of Muḥarram 855 A.H., Sultān Muḥammad Shāh accepted the summons of the just God. After his death in formal matters people have written of him as *Khudāigān Karīm* (the merciful Lord). The period of his rule was seven years and nine months and four days.

<sup>2</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN QUTB-UD-DIN AḤMAD SHĀH, SON OF MUḤAMMAD SHĀH, SON OF AḤMAD SHĀH, SON OF MUḤAMMAD SHĀH, SON OF MUẒAFFAR SHĀH.

The *amīrs* and the great men carried out the rites of mourning for three days; and then on the 4th day, which was the <sup>3</sup> 11th of Muḥarram in the year 855 A.H., they placed the eldest son of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh, who was in his twentieth year, on the throne of empire; and they gave him the title of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn Aḥmad Shāh. His name is Aḥmad but he is celebrated by his title. At the time of his accession, they carried out the rite of *Nithar*, wave offering; and they distributed the gold to the deserving men of the country of Gujrāt, and made them happy and contented. He made the *amīrs* and the great men of the kingdom happy by royal gifts, and titles and high appointments.

<sup>1</sup> The place is called Godhra in the Cambridge History of India, page 301; and it is said there, that Muhammad in spite of his illness advanced as far as Godhra to meet Sultan Maḥmūd Khālji and the latter on hearing this retired to Mandū.

<sup>2</sup> The headings in the MSS., and in the lith. ed., all give the whole genealogy. Frishtah has a shorter heading ذکر سلطنت سلطان قطب الدین بن محمد شاه گجراتی .

<sup>3</sup> Frishtah does not mention the date of the accession, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 37) says indirectly that he was born on the 8th of Jumad-oo-Sany, 855 A.H.; and he ascended the throne in the 49th year of his age. As a matter of fact he was born on the 12th Jamūdi-ul-āḥḥir, 835 A.H. and ascended the throne in his 20th year.

It so happened that when Sultān Muḥammad Shāh died, and Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn took his place. Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī, who had come to aid the Rāy of Chāmpūnīr, <sup>1</sup> and was still on the boundary of Gujrāt, thinking that (the conquest of the country) would be within his power advanced into the country with great rapidity. On the day on which he arrived in the neighbourhood of <sup>2</sup> Barōda, a *maṣṭ* elephant belonging to his army entered the village of Barnāma. The *zunnārdārs* (Brahmans) of Barnāma killed the elephant and the driver. The Sultān was amazed at the boldness of the *ra'iyats*; and ordered, that in revenge the town of Barnāma should be destroyed.

As it was yet the beginning of the reign of Quṭb-ud-dīn, and Sultān Maḥmūd had invaded the country with great strength and violence, <sup>3</sup> Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn consulted with a *baqāl* (grain dealer), who held a position of great proximity (to his person) in his service. The *baqāl* said, "The best course would be that the Sultān should withdraw into the country of Sōrath. When Sultān Maḥmūd should go back to his own country, after leaving an army in Gujrāt, the Sultān would be able to drive away those troops with ease." Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn made inquiries of the truth of this, and wanted to act accordingly. The *amirs*, however, did not allow him to do so, but took him along to carry on the war. When they gained the victory,

<sup>1</sup> Contrary to what is stated in the text, the Cambridge History of India, page 301, says Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī advanced from Mandū with an army of one hundred thousand horse and five hundred elephants.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have *برودرا*, Barōdra, while the other MS. has *برودا* Barōda. I have adopted Barōda, which is the name by which the place is known; though I have heard that Barōdra is the correct ancient name.

<sup>3</sup> The story of the *baqāl* is mentioned by Firishtah in much the same language as in the text. Col. Briggs gives a slightly different version, in which he says that the Sultan "was advised by some of his courtiers to retreat to Sorut (in a note, Western Guzerat called also Kattywar) and allow the king of Mālwa to occupy for the present the eastern provinces", etc. It will be remembered (see note, page 225) that in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, a *bakāl* is said to have given somewhat similar advice to Sultān Muhammad the father of Sultān Kutb-ud-dīn. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* does not say that Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn sought the advice of the *baqāl*; but apparently a *baqāl* was consulted either by the father, or by the son.

they were angry with the *bagāl*; and questioned him. He said, "If the Sultān had the wish to fight, he would have consulted you. As he wanted to flee he asked me."

In short Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn met Sultān Maḥmūd in the village of <sup>1</sup> Kaparbanj which is twenty *karōhs* from Aḥmadābād. At this place <sup>2</sup> Malik 'Alā'-ud-dīn Suhrah, who was the *thānadār* of Sultānpūr, and who had been compelled to join Sultān Maḥmūd, fled from him, and waited on Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn. He was honoured by having seven robes of honour conferred on him in the course of a day, and received the title of 'Alā'-ul-mulk. As there was now a distance of three *karōhs* between the two armies, Sultān Maḥmūd wrote this couplet, and sent it to Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn.

<sup>1</sup> The name is کبرنج and کبرج in the MSS. and کبرینج in the lith. ed. The correct name appears to be کبربنج Kaparbanj. The Cambridge History of India, page 301, calls it Kapadvanj. کیرنج in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> Bayloy (p. 135) quoting from the *Tārīkh-i-Bahādur Shāhī* says that 'Alā'-ud-dīn "shut the gate of the fort (of Sultānpūr) in his face and opened fire both with guns and musketry. Maḥmūd Khiljī besieged the place for seven days. After that through the mediation of Mubārak Khān, son of Aḥmad Shāh and uncle of Kutb-ud-dīn, who had gone to Sultān Maḥmūd at Mandū during the previous reign, and had joined his court", he surrendered the fort, and joined Sultān Maḥmūd Khiljī's service. When asked to swear allegiance to the latter, he swore it in an evasive language. The Cambridge History of India, page 301, calls the fort Nadarbūr (or Nandurbūr and not Sultānpūr); and says that 'Alā'-ud-dīn Suhrah made no attempt to hold it, but surrendered it at once; and sought his own safety by swearing allegiance to the invader, and entering his service. It goes on to say that after this, Sultān Maḥmūd Khiljī marched on Broach, and summoned Marjān, the governor to surrender it. Marjān refused; and Maḥmūd was about to besiege the town when, by the advice of 'Alā'-ud-dīn Suhrah, he decided, instead to attack the capital at once, and marched to Baroda, where he was joined by Gangādās of Chāmpāner and other chiefs. Crossing the Mūhi river he advanced to Kapadvanj, where 'Alā'-ud-dīn deserted him and joined his old master. Nothing of this appears in the *Ṭabaqāt* or in *Firishtah*. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* has a long account of Kutb-ud-dīn's going to a *faqīr* or saint to intercede for him. At last we come to the fact that 'Alā'-ud-dīn returned to his old master, and was received with favour. He told Kutb-ud-dīn, that Sultān Maḥmūd was advancing by Kaparbanj, and advised him to proceed thither (p. 143).

Couplet :

<sup>1</sup> I hear you play the ball without a *chaugān*, in your house,  
If you wish to challenge, come ; this is the ball, and this the  
field.

Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn ordered Ṣadr Jahān to write a reply to the  
couplet. Ṣadr Jahān wrote in reply.

Couplet :

If a *chaugān* I take in my hand, thy head like a ball shall I hurl ;  
But I am ashamed to torment my prisoner in this way.

In this couplet there is a hint to the fact, that Sultān Hūshang, who  
was the master and patron of Sultān Maḥmūd, had been captured  
and had been kept as a prisoner by Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh, who had,  
however, afterwards treated him with favour and had given back to  
him the kingdom of Mālwa : as the pen has conveyed this meaning  
in the account of the reign of Muẓaffar Shāh. After this, after some  
days on the night of the <sup>2</sup> 3rd Ṣafar, Sultān Maḥmūd mounted with  
the intention of making a surprise night attack : <sup>3</sup> but being defeated  
went away to Mālwa, as has been described in detail in the section  
about Mālwa. On the way the Kōlis and Bhils greatly harassed  
(Sultān Maḥmūd's army). Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn returned to Aḥmadā-  
bād, his capital, crowned with victory and triumph.

After a time the *vazīrs* said that <sup>4</sup> Firūz Khān, son of Shams Khān  
Dandānī, who was the ruler of Nāgōr, had died. His brother Mujāhid  
Khān took possession of Nāgōr ; and Shams Khān, his son, for fear  
of his <sup>5</sup> uncle had fled, and sought the protection of Rānā Kūmbhā, son

<sup>1</sup> There are some verbal differences in the couplet as given in the MSS.,  
and in the lith. ed. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I have adopted the version  
which appeared to me to be the best.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah has در سلج منفر "towards the end of Ṣafar" ; and the Cambridge  
History of India, page 301, says that the abortive night attack was made on  
the night of the 1st April, 1451.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India, page 301, give somewhat  
detailed account of the abortive night attack, and the battle which took place  
on the following morning.

<sup>4</sup> Firūz Khān died in 860 A.H., 1453 A.D.

<sup>5</sup> Both MSS., and the lith. ed. have برادر, brother, which is of course  
incorrect. Firishtah has عم uncle. برادر in the text-edition.

of Rānā Mūkul. Rānā Kūmbhā determined that he would recover Nāgōr from the possession of Mujāhid Khān, and make it over to Shams Khān, but on the condition that the latter would demolish three of the turrets of the citadel of Nāgōr. His reason for this was that before this Rānā Mūkul had fled in great distress and disgrace from Firūz Khān, and in that battle three thousand Rājput̃s had been slain; and if now his son demolished three of the bastions of the fort, the people of the world would say that, although Rānā Mūkul had fled, yet he having acquired power over the fort had had his revenge. Shams Khān, who was helpless, accepted this condition in his great distress. After some days Rānā Kūmbhā having collected troops marched against Nāgōr; and Mujāhid Khān being unable to meet him, went and begged for help from Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji. Shams Khān then went and took possession of the fort of Nāgōr. Rānā Kūmbhā sent him a message, that he should now carry out his promise. Shams Khān summoned the *amīrs* and the heads of the clans and brought up the matter for discussion. Some of them said that it was a matter of pity that Firūz Khān had not begotten a daughter, so that she might have saved the honour of the family. Shams Khān replied in a spirit of shame and self depreciation and anger and said that it was not possible that any part of the fort should be demolished, till many heads should have been cut off. Rānā Kūmbhā on hearing this news went back to his own country, and having collected a large army again advanced on Nāgōr. Shams Khān having repaired the ruined parts of the fort, left all his army and the heads of the clans in it, and himself went on wings of speed to Aḥmadābād to seek for help. Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn Aḥmad Shāh conferred many favours on him, and married his daughter in the *nikāḥ* form. After the marriage festivities were finished, he sent <sup>1</sup> Rāy Rām Chand Nāik, and Malik Gadāi and some other *amīrs* to re-inforce the men of Nāgōr; and kept Shams Khān in attendance on himself till the day, when it was reported to him, that Rānā Kūmbhā had fought with the men of Nāgōr, and had slain a large number of them; and had devastated wherever there was any cultivation and people outside the fort.

---

<sup>1</sup> رای امین چند پایک in the text-edition.

On hearing this news, the spirit of anger and daring of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn was excited, and he advanced against the fort of <sup>1</sup> Kūmbhahūr in the year 860 A.B. When he arrived in the vicinity of the fort of Ābū, Gītā Dēorah, the Rājā of the fort came out and did homage, and represented that Rānā Kūmbhā had taken the fort from him by force, and had left his own *thānadār* there. Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn appointed Malik Sha'hān Sultānī, who had the title of 'Imād-ul-mulk in charge of the fort of Ābū, and himself advanced towards his original destination. Malik 'Imād-ul-mulk, who was inexperienced, immediately commenced a battle, and had a large number of his men slain. When this news reached the Sultān, he declared, that he would, at the time of his return capture the fort of Ābū, and make it over to Gītā Dēorah. He sent a messenger to summon 'Imād-ul-mulk; and himself advanced to seize the fort of Sirōhi. When he arrived in its neighbourhood, the Rājā engaged him in a battle and was defeated.

From that place, the Sultān invaded the country of Rānā Kūmbhā; and sent troops in all directions, so that they might ravage the country, and destroy the temples. When he arrived at the fort of Kūmbhahūr, Rānā Kūmbhā sallied out of the fort, set the fire of warfare ablaze; and having had a large number of his followers slain,

<sup>1</sup> Called Kumbhagarh in the Cambridge History of India, page 302. Bayley, page 149, calls it Kūmbhāhūr and says in a note, quoting Tod's Rājasthān, Chapter VIII, that it was one of the 32 fortresses erected by Rānā Kūmbhā. In Rās Mālā (vol. I. p. 352) it is called Kūmbher and it is said to be the greatest of the 32 fortresses attributed to Kūmbho. Altogether there are 84 fortresses erected for the defence of Mewār. The correct name of Rānā Kūmbho appears, according to an inscription in a temple, which stands at the village called Rāmpoor, about five miles from the town of Sūdee or Sūdree in Mewār, to have been Rānā Shree Kūmbh Kurn, or according to correct transliteration Rānā Śrī Kūmbhukarna (note on page 353).

<sup>2</sup> The Cambridge History of India makes no mention of the incidents, which took place at the fort of Ābū. Frīshlah does, but he says nothing about the Rājā rendering homage to the Sultān. The name of the Rājā of Ābū is given in the MSS. as گیتا دیورہ and in the lith. ed. as گیتا دیورہ. In the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, page 149) he is called Khatīā Dēorah, Rājā of Sirōhi. This can scarcely be correct, as the Rājā of Sirōhi appears to have fought with Qutb-ud-dīn, and to have been defeated by him.

again retired into the fort. He, however, sent out parties every day; and fought battles; and each time defeat fell on him. In the end, Kūmbhā came forward in distress and humility, and offered suitable tribute. The Sultān then returned to Aḥmadābād.

<sup>1</sup> At the end of the year, Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji sent <sup>2</sup> Tāj Khān who was one of his great *amīrs*, to the boundary of Gujrāt, to knock at the door of peace. The *amīrs* and the chief men of Gujrāt induced Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn for the benefit of the people, to agree to the treaty.

<sup>3</sup> Shaikh Niẓām-ud-dīn and the prince of the learned men Ṣadr Jahān came to Chāmpānīr from the side of Sultān Maḥmūd, and Qāḍī Ḥisām-ud-dīn and some others went from Aḥmadābād. They drew up the treaty in this way, that the armies of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn should plunder and ravage such parts of the territories of Rānā Kūmbhā as were contiguous to Gujrāt; and Sultān Maḥmūd should seize <sup>4</sup> the country of Mēwār and Amhar, and the neighbouring country. (It was also agreed that) whenever necessary they should not fail to give help and assistance to each other. Letters of peace

<sup>1</sup> According to the Cambridge History of India, page 302, Ghiyās-ud-dīn, son of Maḥmūd Khālji, led a raid into his dominions as far as Sūrāt, but retired hurriedly on hearing of Quṭb-ud-dīn's return; and it was after this that Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji sent the mission to propose a treaty of peace. The raid led by Ghiyās-ud-dīn is not mentioned in the text or in Firishtah or in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* or in *Rās Mālā*.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah says Tāj Khān was the وزیر کل, minister in-charge of all departments of Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji. Neither the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* nor the Cambridge History of India gives the name of the ambassador.

<sup>3</sup> The names of the men sent to draft the treaty do not appear to be mentioned in any other history.

<sup>4</sup> The lith. ed. of Firishtah has بلاد و قراہی میوات و امہر, and Col. Briggs the districts of Mowar and Aheerwara. The other histories do not give the names of the districts which were to be ravaged respectively by the Gujrāt and Mālwa armies. The Cambridge History of India, page 302, says, that the western part of the Rānā's dominion were allotted to Gujarāt, and the eastern parts to Mālwa. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* (Bayloy, page 150) is less definite. According to it, Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji would assail the Rānā from one side and Sultān Kutb-ud-dīn from the other. *Rās Mālā* (vol. I, p. 353) says that the treaty was to the effect that Rānā Koombho's dominion should be partitioned "between the two Mohammedan powers".

containing these terms were written, and made over to the great men of the age.

In the year 861 A.H. (1451 A.D.) Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn again marched to invade Kūmbhalmīr, and on the way he took the fortress of Ābū, and according to his promise, delivered it over to Gītā Dēōrah. From Ābū he advanced towards Kūmbhalmīr; and Rānā Kūmbhā left that place and retired to the fort of Chitōr. On the way he saw an uneven and difficult place, and halted there. After the two armies had met, the fire of war blazed up; but when night came, they retired to their respective places. On the next day, the battle began again, and Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn himself fought like Rustam. Rānā Kūmbhā then hid himself in the hills: and sent emissaries, and begged for pardon. He sent <sup>1</sup> four maunds of gold and some elephants, and other tribute, and entered into an engagement, that he would after that never again cause any injury to the country of Nāgōr. Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn returned with victory and triumph, and went back to Aḥmadābād.

But three months had not yet elapsed, when news came that Rānā Kūmbhā was again attempting, with an army of fifty thousand horsemen, to devastate Nāgōr. The same day that the news came, <sup>2</sup> the Sultān came out of Aḥmadābād, and halted for a month outside the city, for the purpose of mustering his troops. Rānā Kūmbhā, hearing the news of the Sultān's preparations, retired to his own station and took up his position there. Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn also on hearing the news returned, and entered the city, and spent his time in pleasure and enjoyment.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah makes it fourteen *mans* of gold and two large elephants and other fine things. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 42) says that 14 maunds of solid gold and two elephants which carried it were paid to Kootb Shah; and a seasonable donation was also made to Sooltan Mahmood Khiljy: but that was after the latter had advanced on Chitor.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah is more explicit about the Sultān's promptitude in starting. He says that the messenger bearing the report came to Aḥmadābād at night, when the *سلطان بصحبت شراب مشغول بود*. He went to the *vazīr*, who went the same night to the Sultān, but found him drunk and senseless. He could not wait, but put the Sultān in a *miḥaffah* (a litter), and took him one stage the next day; and then they halted for one month for the *استعداد لشکر* or mustering of the troops.



In the beginning of the year 1862 A.H., the Sultān made a strong resolution to punish the *zamīndārs*; and marched to Sirōhī. The<sup>2</sup> Rāja who was a relation of Rānā Kūmbhā fled to the hills, and took shelter there; and for the third time Sirōhī was burnt down; and the other towns were raided and ravaged. Then (the Sultān) sent detachments to ravage the dominions of Rānā Kūmbhā; and himself advanced to the fort of Kūmbhalmīr. At this time intelligence came that Sultān Maḥmūd Kḥaljī had advanced towards the fort of Chitōr, by way of Mandsūr; and seized all the *parganas* near the last-named place. Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn now besieged the Rānā in the fort of Kūmbhalmīr with a firm determination; but as a considerable time elapsed, and he knew that it would be difficult to seize it, he gave up the siege, and advanced towards the fortress of Chitōr; and after plundering and ravaging the country around it,<sup>3</sup> went back to Aḥmadābād. To everyone of the soldiers whose horses had become disabled during the campaigns, the Sultān gave the price of one from the treasury; and thought it proper, in this way, to show kindness to them. Rānā Kūmbhā sent ambassadors after the Sultān and in great humility and distress prayed to be excused for his offences; and the Sultān again drew the pen of forgiveness across his guilt; and sent back the ambassadors, pleased and happy.

And again in the year 863 A.H., the Sultān wanted to march with his army; but he happened to fall ill. He then went one day to see Saiyid Muḥammad, who was celebrated as Quṭb-i-Ālam, who lived in peace and contentment in the town of Batūh; and resolved in his mind, how nice it were if the holy and high God should bestow on him a

---

<sup>1</sup> The year is *اثنین و سبعین و ثمانمائة* in both MSS., (one of which also gives it in figures, 872), and in the lith. ed., but this is incorrect; the correct year being 862 A.H. or perhaps 861 A.H. Firishtah has 861; Col. Briggs 861 A.H., 1457 A.D., and the Cambridge History of India, 1456 as the year of the destruction of Sirōhī. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* (Bayley) has 862 A.H., 1456 as the year. It will be seen that later on the MSS. and the lith. ed. give the correct year 863 A.H.

<sup>2</sup> He is called Sains Mal in the Cambridge History of India, page 302. I cannot find his name anywhere else.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah says that Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn returned to his capital with *غنیمت بیقیاس*, i.e., plunder that could not be conceived; but contrary to that Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 42) says that the Rana gave fourteen maunds of solid gold and two elephants. See note 1, page 233.

worthy son. His Holiness the Saiyid, the beloved of God, may God sanctify his tomb! knew what was in the Sultān's mind by his spiritual illumination; and said "Your younger brother, who is like your son will keep the dynasty of Muẓaffar Shāh alive". The Sultān rose in despondence; and day by day his illness increased. He died on the 123rd Rajab of the afore-mentioned year, and was buried in the enclosure of Sultān Muḥammad Shāh's tomb. In proclamations and *farmāns* they styled him Sultān Ghāzī. The period of his reign was <sup>2</sup> seven years and six months and thirteen days. He was a *bādshāh* noted for his bravery and high spirits; but at the times when the fire of his wrath flamed up, and specially when he was intoxicated with wine, he did many evil deeds and was greedy and reckless in killing and shedding blood.

When Sultān Quth-ul-dīn died, his *amīrs* put Shams Khān son of Firūz Khān to death, on the suspicion that his daughter, who was a *nikaḥ* wife of the Sultān, had given him poison; and the mother of the Sultān made her over to the slave girls, who tore her to pieces, and thus killed her with torment.

### 3 AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN DĀUD SHĀH, SON OF AHMAD SHĀH, SON OF MUḤAMMAD SHĀH, SON OF MUẒAFFAR SHĀH.

When the *amīrs*, and the pillars of the state, and the great men of the kingdom had carried out the ceremonies of mourning for

<sup>1</sup> Col. Briggs gives the 25th May, 1459, as the date of his death whereas the Cambridge History of India, page 303, has May 18th, 1458. Neither the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* nor *Rūs Mālū* gives the date of his death or the period of his reign; but the former has some curious stories about his wounding himself in the knee; but (Bayley, p. 158) quoting the *Tārīkh-i-Bahādar-Shāhī* says that Shams Khān's daughter gave him poison at the instigation of her father. Firishtah's account of the way in which Shams Khān and his daughter were murdered is somewhat different as regards the particulars. The Cambridge History of India, page 303, says "Quth-ul-dīn's officers at Nāgaur put Shams Khān to death", which cannot be correct if it implies that he was put to death at Nāgōr. As regards his daughter it says, that she was made over to her jealous co-wives. Firishtah does say that she was made over to *از خونین دل بودند*, but the statements are hardly identical.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah has seven years and seven months.

<sup>3</sup> There are slight differences in the heading. I have translated it as it is in one MS. The other MS. omits the word *سلطان*; and the lith. ed. substitutes *سلطنت* for *سلطان*.

Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn, they placed Shāh-zāda Dāūd Khān, son of Aḥmad Shāh, who was the uncle of the deceased Sultān on the throne of empire. As the recorder of destiny and fate had not written the order of *saltanat* against his name, he began to commit unworthy deeds and to perpetrate wicked acts. Some acts, which bore the suspicion of meanness of spirit were perpetrated by him from time to time and became the cause of the abhorrence of the people. <sup>1</sup> For instance, he made the promise of conferring the title of 'Imād-ul-mulk on a <sup>2</sup> *farrāsh* who was his neighbour at the time when he was a Shāh-zāda; and the *amīrs* and great men seeing such <sup>3</sup> ill-regulated acts of his, became annoyed with him; and they directed, that he should be excused from the work of government. They sent Malik <sup>4</sup> 'Alā-ul-

<sup>1</sup> There is a difference in the readings. Both the MSS. have *ایضاً یکی از* *فراشانرا*, but the lith. ed. has *از انجمله فراشی*.

<sup>2</sup> The man was a *farrāsh*. A *farrash* is a kind of cotton cloth which is spread on the ground for people to sit upon; and the *farrāsh*, strictly speaking, is a man who spreads such cloth and keeps it in his charge; and generally, a man who keeps the house, and the furniture in it, swept and garnished. He is, however, different from an ordinary sweeper; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 45) is wrong in calling him "one of the common sweepers of the household". Bayley (p. 159) calls him more correctly a carpet-spreader; and unlike Firishtah, who says that Sultān Dāūd conferred the title of 'Imād-ul-mulk on the man, and made him one of the great *amīrs*, agrees with Niẓām-ud-dīn, and says he only held out the hope of granting the title to him. The Cambridge History of India is indefinite, and says that the new Sultān conferred high honours on unworthy favourites. Sultān Dāūd's act was unconventional, and must have given umbrage to the *amīrs* as a body, but it did not, I think, involve any moral turpitude.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have *نامنظم*, but the other MS. *ناملايم*. I have adopted the former.

<sup>4</sup> Malik 'Alā-ul-mulk in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but Malik 'Imād-ul-mulk in the other MS. There is a good deal of confusion about this. Firishtah lith. ed., says nothing about anybody being sent to the mother of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn; but says that by the advice of 'Imād-ul-mulk, they raised Mahmūd Khān, the younger brother of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn, who was in his fourteenth year to the throne. The Cambridge History of India, page 303, says that the *amīrs* raised his (which would mean Dāūd's, which is certainly incorrect) younger brother Abu'l-Fath Mahmūd on the throne. Bayley (p. 160) says that the *amīrs* deputed 'Ala-ul-Mulk bin Suhrāb to the mother of Fateh Khān. I have adopted 'Alā-ul-mulk. *عماد الملک* has been adopted in the text-edition.

mulūk bin Sulhrah to the palace of Makhdūma-i-Jahān, the widow of Sultān Muḥammad, who was a <sup>1</sup> daughter of one of the Sultāns of *Hind*, so that he might bring Shāhzāda Faṭḥ Khān, son of Muḥammad Shāh; and all of them combined together to place him on the throne. Makhdūma-i-Jahān said in reply, "Please keep your hands off my <sup>2</sup> son; for he has not the strength to bear this heavy burden." It so happened, however, that Malik 'Alā-ul-mulūk went privately to wait on Shāhzāda Faṭḥ Khān, and made him mount a horse, and took him to the royal palace. The other *amīrs* hastened to wait on him; and carried out the ceremony of congratulating him; and on that very day, which was Sunday, the first of Sha'bān of that year placed him on the throne of empire; and gave him the title of Sultān Maḥmūd.

The period of the reign of Dāūd Shāh was <sup>3</sup> seven days.

#### <sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN MAḤMŪD SHĀH, SON OF MUḤAMMAD SHĀH.

When Sultān Maḥmūd ascended the throne of Gujrāt on Sunday, the <sup>2</sup> first day of Sha'bān 863 A.H., according to the advice and counsel

<sup>1</sup> According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 160, she was Bibi Moghali, who appears to have been a daughter of one of the Jūms of Sind.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have فرزندان sons; but the other MS. has فرزند son.

<sup>3</sup> The period of the reign of Dāūd Shāh is not mentioned by Firishtah or by Col. Briggs. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley (p. 160), agrees with Nizām-ud-dīn, and has seven days. Rūs Mālū says indefinitely, only a few days; but the *Cambridge History of India*, page 303, gives him a reign of "no more than 27 days". This is incorrect; and is contradicted by the fact that the date of the death of Qutb-ud-dīn is said in the same page to have been May 18th, 1458, and that of the accession of Sultān Maḥmūd, also in the same page, May 25th. Unlike others Dāūd Shāh does not appear to have come at once to a violent end. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley (p. 160), says "Sultān Dāūd got out of a window facing the river Sābar, and went in to hiding. He reigned only seven days. It is related, that he entered as an inquirer into the monastery of Shēkh Adhan Rūmī, and became one of his attendants; in a short time he obtained advancement (in spiritual rank). He soon afterwards died."

<sup>4</sup> That is the heading in both MSS. The lith. ed. has ذکر سلطنت فتح خان .  
المخاطب محمود شاه بن محمد شاه بن احمد شاه .

<sup>5</sup> Neither Firishtah nor Col. Briggs gives the date of the accession. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* gives the same day and date as in the text; and the corresponding A.D. date as 18th June, 1459. Rūs Mālū does not give the date.

of the *amīrs*, and sat in the place of his father, he made the various sections of the people happy by his universal benefactions in accordance with their respective ranks. They say, that on that day, in addition to Arab, 'Iraqī and Turkī horses, and valuable robes of honour, and jewelled-belts and swords, and daggers embossed with gold, a *karōr* of *tankas* was given away.

When six months had passed, <sup>1</sup>Malik Kabir Sultānī, who had the title of 'Add-ul-mulk, Maulānā Khidr, who had that of Ṣafī-ul-mulk, Pīārah Ismā'īl, who bore that of Burhān-ul-mulk, and Jhajū Muḥammad, who had that of Ḥisām-ul-mulk, from the wickedness of their natures and the refractoriness of their dispositions, prepared to create turmoil and disturbance. They resolved amongst themselves, that they would cause Malik Sha'būn <sup>2</sup> 'Imād-ul-mulk, in whose grasp of power the reins of the *vazārat* were, to be removed (from his office), so that this wicked intention and dishonest determination of theirs might gain currency and success. In order to carry out this resolution, they represented (to the Sultān) in private, that 'Imād-ul-mulk wanted to place <sup>3</sup> his own son, Shahūb-ud-dīn, on the throne; and like Malik Mughīth Khaljī has determined that the rule of the empire should be

The Cambridge History of India, page 303, does not give the A.H. date but gives an A.D. date different from that given by Bayley, *viz.*, May 25th, 1458.

<sup>1</sup> The names and titles of the conspirators are the same in the MSS. and the lith. ed., except that the last name which is جھجو محمد Jhajū Muḥammad in the MSS. appears to be منجھو محمد Manjhū Muḥammad in the lith. ed.

Firishtah mentions the first three of the conspirators by their titles alone. Col. Briggs gives the titles of all four. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 163, gives slightly different names and titles; *viz.*, Kabir-ud-dīn Sultānī entitled Burhān-ul-Mulk, Maulāna Khīzr entitled Ṣafī-ul-Mulk, Hūmid bin Isma'īl entitled 'Azd-ul-Mulk, and Khwūjah Muhammad entitled Ḥisām-ul-Mulk.

<sup>2</sup> This عماد الملك appears to be the same person who is designated علا الملك earlier on. See note 4 on p. 236.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah and Col. Briggs and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley) all agree that the conspirators accused 'Imād-ul-mulk with the intention of raising his own son Shahūb-ud-dīn, on the throne; and Nizām-ud-dīn's reference to Malik Mughīth Khaljī confirms this; but the Cambridge History of India, page 303, says quite incorrectly, that the conspirators accused 'Imād-ul-mulk of the determination of placing Sultān Mahmūd's own son, whom it gives the name of Shihūb-ud-dīn, and describes as an infant, on the throne, so that he might be able to govern the country as regent.

transferred to his own family. Maḥmūd Shāh told them, that he had also inferred the same thing from 'Imād-ul-mulk's behaviour. He gave orders for the latter being arrested, and placed in confinement. He was kept under guard on the upper floor of the gate of Aḥmadābād. The Sultān placed five hundred of the men whom he trusted to guard him. 'Aḍd-ul-mulk and the other conspirators, (thinking that they were quite) successful, went to their own houses.

It so happened, however, that Malik 'Abd-ul-lah, the superintendent of the elephants, who was one of the men, in whom the Sultān reposed confidence, asked for a private audience, and having reported the deceit and treachery of that deceitful crew, stated that they had taken <sup>1</sup> Shāhẓāda Ḥasan Khān to the house of one of themselves, and having made asseverations and taking oaths, had made the imprisonment of 'Imād-ul-mulk, a means for attaining their own objects. Sultān Maḥmūd made enquiries, and having impressed the true state of things on his mind, and keeping some of his old and faithful adherents, such as <sup>2</sup> Ḥājī and Malik Bahā-ud-dīn and Malik Kālū and Malik 'Aīn-ud-dīn with him, said to Malik 'Abd-ul-lah, that he should get all the elephants ready and bring them to the *darbār*, so that he might throw 'Imād-ul-mulk under the feet of an elephant. He also ordered Malik Sharf-ul-mulk, that he should bring the wicked and ungrateful Sha'hān to the *darbār*, so that the superintendent of the elephants may throw him under the feet of an elephant. When Malik Sharf-ul-mulk went to bring 'Imād-ul-mulk, the guards said, that they could not hand him over without the permission of Malik 'Aḍd-ul-mulk. He came back, and reported what the guards had said, to the Sultān. Sultān Maḥmūd then ascended to the top of the bastion, and said in

---

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah also says that the conspirators wanted to raise prince Ḥasan Khān on the throne, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 16) has changed the name to Hoossein. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* (Bayley, p. 164), however, says that the conspirators wanted to raise Ḥabīb Khān on the *masnad*; and Bayley says in a note, that according to Firishtah and the *Tārīkh-i-Aḥḍi*, the accession of Ḥabīb Khān was the real object of the plot. The statement as far as Firishtah is concerned appears to me to be incorrect. The Cambridge History of India, page 303, agrees with Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah, that it was Ḥasan Khān, whom the conspirators wanted to place on the throne.

<sup>2</sup> The name is Ḥājī without any prefix or suffix in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed.; but Firishtah and the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* both call him Malik Ḥājī.



the *darbār-hall* attended by the riff-raff of the city, and their own retainers. When they came near ‘Imād-ul-mulk and Malik Hāji and the other *sardārs*, with the immediate servants (of the Sultān) placed the elephants before them, and made an attack on the rebels; and ‘Add-ul-mulk and the other traitors fled. Their soldiers threw away their arms in the lanes of the city, and hid themselves. Out of the rebel *amīrs*, Hīsam-ud-dīn went to his brother, Rukn-ud-dīn, who was the *kōtṛāl* of Pattan; and from that place they both went away to Mālwa; ‘Add-ul-mulk, with a single retainer went among the *grāssias*; and as his retainers had slain some of the *grāssias* of that neighbourhood, they recognised him and slew him; and they sent his head, <sup>1</sup> filled with turbulence, to Aḥmadābād. As Burhān-ul-mulk was a man of big size, he could not run away, and concealed himself

hundred or three thousand men including free men and slaves with the Sultān; and they all wa-had their hands of their lives, and became thoroughly frightened. Some said let us go into such and such a mansion and shut the doors and defend ourselves. Others said, let us collect as much of the jewels and treasure as we can, and make our escape. The Sultān did not approve of either of these counsels, but armed himself, and bound his quiver round his waist; and with the thirty (three) hundred followers, and the elephants which did not exceed two hundred in number came out of the palace to meet the rebels. He posted the elephants at the heads of the various approaches so that the enemy might not attack from different sides, and advanced with the greatest calmness and composure. The people on seeing this immediately deserted the rebels, and some joined the Sultān, and others hid themselves. Col. Briggs’s account (vol. IV. p. 48) agrees with the above but he makes the number of the rebels thirty thousand and that of the Sultan’s followers, 300; although in the Persian text the one is *سی هزار سوار و پیاده* and the other *سی صد سوار*. It must be said, however, that the number of the Sultān’s followers is also given in the *Ṭabaqāt* as *سیصد*.

Bayley (p. 165) also says that the Sultān’s followers amounted only to three hundred in number; and some of them suggested that they should get out of the palace by the windows on the side of the *Sābar*(mat), and collect men and then return; but the Sultān did not listen to these cowards.

<sup>1</sup> There is some difference in the readings. The MSS. have *سرپر شر* head filled with turbulence, and *سرپر تیر*, head placed on an arrow; and the lith. ed. has *سرپر سر*, which is not intelligible. None of the readings is quite satisfactory, but I have adopted the first. *Firishtah* has *سر اورا بریده*, having cut off his head.



near the town of Sarkhéj, in the uneven ground near the Sābarmati. It so happened that one of the eunuchs went to circumambulate the tomb of Shaikh Aḥmad Khattū, may his soul be sanctified! He saw Burhān-ul-mulk seated there, and immediately seized him, and brought him to the *darbār*, where by order of the Sultān he was <sup>1</sup> executed. Maulānā Khidr, Ṣafī-ul-mulk, <sup>2</sup> was seized and sent to Dīp in imprisonment. As this disturbance was suppressed in this way, and friend was discriminated from foe, <sup>3</sup> 'Imād-ul-mulk threw the skirt of his spirit over the grandeur of the *vazārat*; and like men freed (of the cares of the world) he held his hand from all worldly affairs; and took kindly to the nook of contentment and <sup>4</sup> seclusion; and relinquishing his *jāgīr* became a beadsman. <sup>5</sup> Sultān Maḥmūd began to show favour to his soldiers, granted <sup>6</sup> favours to fifty-two of his own servants, so that in the course of a short time, the number of his soldiers became double that of Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn and of the former Sultāns. He conferred titles on all his own slaves; Malik Ḥājī was honoured with the title of 'Imād-ul-mulk, and the office of the paymaster of the forces. Malik Bahā'-ud-dīn was made Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk, Malik Tughān Farḥat-ul-mulk, Malik 'Ain-ud-dīn Nizām-ul-mulk, and Malik Sa'ad Bakht Burhān-ul-mulk.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah says *بریز پای فیل مست انداخته با خاک یکسان ساختند*, i.e., he was trodden to death under the feet of a *maṣī* elephant.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah says he was not executed as *چون چندان گناه نداشت*, i.e., as he was not so guilty as the others.

<sup>3</sup> According to Firishtah the Sultān did not forget 'Imād-ul-mulk's services. He says *و سلطان محمود نیز حقوق خدمات شایسته او منظور داشته او را معذور داشت و پسر بزرگ او شهاب الدین احمد را خطاب ملک الشرف داده از امرای کلان گردانید*

<sup>4</sup> The lith. ed. has *کنج*, before *عزلت*, but as both the MSS. omit it, I have also omitted it.

<sup>5</sup> Some of these matters are mentioned with some variation in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* (Bayley, p. 166).

<sup>6</sup> It is not clear who these fifty-two servants or slaves were; and why the favours shown to them led to the increase in the number of troops. As to the increase the actual words are *دو بیست*, in the MSS. and *دو بیست* in the lith. ed. I have adopted the readings of the MSS., and think that it means in the proportion of twenty to ten, i.e., double. Some of these events are mentioned in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* (Bayley, p. 167).

<sup>1</sup> In the year 864 A.H. he marched in the direction of Kaparbanj; and having gone hunting as far as the boundary of Mālwa returned. In the course of this expedition he regulated the administration of the *thānas*, and of the *parganas*; and attended with care to the condition of the oppressed. In the year <sup>2</sup> 866 A.H., he started from the capital city of Ahmadābād with the object of seeing the country and hunting; and encamped on the bank of the river Khārī, which is fifteen *karōhs* from Ahmadābād. At this time he received a letter from <sup>3</sup> Nizām Shāh, son of Humāyūn Shāh, the ruler of the Deccan in which after complaining (of the injuries he had received) at the hand of Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī, he asked for assistance and reinforcement. <sup>4</sup> Maḥmūd Shāh with a very large army and five hundred elephants advanced to help Nizām Shāh. When he arrived at Nudarbār and Sultānpūr, another letter came (to the effect) that Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī, in his pride of his large army, had advanced against this *faqīr* (*i.e.*, he himself) by rapid marches; and after the two armies had met, in the first instance he was defeated; and the soldiers of the writer plundered his camp, and seized fifty elephants. But Sultān Maḥmūd came out of ambush with twelve thousand horsemen, when his (*i.e.*, Nizām Shāh's) men were engaged in plundering. Sikandar Khān Bukhārī and Khwājah Jahān Turk (who were commanders of Nizām Shāh's army) exerted themselves, as much as they could; (but) Sultān Maḥmūd

<sup>1</sup> This excursion is not mentioned by Firishlah or any other historian except the author of the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* (Bayley, p. 175).

<sup>2</sup> The year is 866 in the MSS., but 865 in the lith. ed. Firishlah also has 866 and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 49) 866 A.H., 1462 A.D. Bayley (p. 175) also gives the same year, and he calls the river Khārī, and says, on the authority of the *Tabakāt-i-Akbarī*, it is eleven *kōs* from Ahmadābād.

<sup>3</sup> He was a mere child at this time, and the government was carried on by his mother and the prime minister, and there was a certain amount of jealousy and intrigue (see pp. 87, 88 in the history of his reign).

<sup>4</sup> Firishlah says that the *amīrs* and the chief men of the city attempted to dissuade Maḥmūd Shāh from going away on a distant expedition, so soon after his accession, specially as Dāūd Khān was attempting to recover the throne, which he had occupied for a week; but he did not agree with them, and advanced arguments based on philosophical and humanitarian grounds in support of his determination. This is referred to by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 49), but it does not appear to be mentioned in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* or in the Cambridge History of India.

himself advancing within bowshot, shot an arrow, which hit the forehead of Sikandar Khān's elephant. The animal turned round, and caused much havoc to the Deccan army; and Sikandar Khān and Khwājah Jahān Turk seized the bridle of the *faqīr*'s horse, and started for Bīdar. The *faqīr* is at present at Fīrūzābād; and Sultān Maḥmūd is besieging the city of Bīdar. As His Majesty has advanced in this direction, with the object of helping the *faqīr*, it is hoped that he would come with all rapidity.

Maḥmūd Shāh directed his attention to the Deccan. He heard on the way that Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji had turned back, and was going towards Mālwa. Maḥmūd Shāh advanced into the country of Asīr and Burhānpūr, that he might close the path<sup>1</sup> of his flight; and encamped in the neighbourhood of Tālnīr, which is in the country of Asīr. Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji leaving the well-known road travelled by way of <sup>2</sup> Gōndwāna; and owing to the difficulty of the road, and want of water, his men suffered great hardship. They say that more than thousand men perished for want of <sup>3</sup> water. Maḥmūd Shāh wrote and sent a letter to the effect, that "Whenever that <sup>4</sup> pupil of the

<sup>1</sup> One MS. inserts *گريز* between *مسدود* and *يرو*. I think this is correct and have inserted it, though it is not found in the other MS. and in the lith. ed.

<sup>2</sup> The Cambridge History of India (p. 304) instead of saying that Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji travelled through Gōndwānā like the other histories, says that he was compelled to retire through the Mahādeo hills into Northern Berar, where his army suffered severely both from want of water and from the attacks of the Korkūs. I have nowhere else come across the name of the Mahādeo hills or of the Korkūs. In the Persian text of Muntāḥab-al-labāb, edited by Sir W. Haig, the editor of the Cambridge History of India, the retreat of Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji (vol. III, p. 98), is said to have been through Gōndwāna, and it is said that there was no sign of water along the route anywhere, and the troops are said to have suffered from thirst and at the hands of robbers roaming over the hills. In the Index of the Cambridge History of India the Mahādeo hills are mentioned only once in this particular place, and the Korkūs are mentioned only thrice. From one of these references (p. 358), it would appear that the "Korkūs" is only another name for the Gōnds.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. adds *و تنگی راه* and the narrowing or difficulty of the road.

<sup>4</sup> Both MSS. have *نرزند سلطنت*, but the lith. ed. has *قرة العين سلطنت*. I have retained the latter, as it is the common form of the word, which means lit. the pupil of the eye, but is applied figuratively to some one who is very dear, such as one's son or daughter.



In the year 869 A.H. (1465 A.D.) it was reported to the Sultān that the *zamīndārs* of <sup>1</sup> Bāwar and of the fort of Dīn had for two years been causing damage to the ships; and as they had never received any punishment from the Sultāns of Gujrāt, they had got into a habit of refractoriness and revolt. Although his loyal advisers did not consider it advisable that he should march to attack them, owing to the difficulty of the route and the strength of the fortress, he determined to conquer that tract, and punish the rebellious chiefs. When after enduring a thousand hardships and difficulties, he advanced to the vicinity of the fort, the commandant came out to give battle; and made gallant efforts. (But) when night came, he again took shelter in the fort; and for some days, he fought battles every day, and fulfilled the duty of making war-like and gallant exertions. It happened, however, that one day the Sultān went to the top of the hill of Bāwar with his retinue and soldiers. When the men of the fort <sup>2</sup> saw the royal umbrella, and became aware of the large number of soldiers, they with humility put their hands <sup>3</sup> on the skirt of peace; and <sup>4</sup> the

---

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. have *زمین دار باور و بندر دین* and *امین داران باور و بندر دین*, and the lith. ed. has *زمیندار و باور و بندر دین*. I have adopted the reading of the second MS. Firishṭah lith. ed. has *قلعه ماورا و بندر دین*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 51) calls Bāwar, Ravnr "an extraordinary hill fort". The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* (Bayley, p. 178) has the mountain of Bāwar, and Bayley says in a note that the best accounts of the expedition are to be found in the *Tabakāt-i-Akbarī*, *Firishṭah* and the *Tārīkh-i-Alfi*; and he quotes from the first two, which both have Bāwar. As to Dīn he says there is a small port marked Dinnu near to a spot where a spur of the ghats runs into the sea. He gives the various variants of Bāwar in the different MSS. and the MS. of the *Tārīkh-i-Alfi*; and they all have some resemblance to Bāwar; yet the Cambridge History of India, without a single word of explanation or a single reference to any authority, transforms the *zamīndārs* of Bāwar and of the port of Dīn to "the Hindu chief of Pardī near Damān" (see page 305). The conjunction *و* between *باور* and *قلعه دین* has unfortunately been changed into *د* in the text edition, and as a result *باورد* reads *باورد*.

<sup>2</sup> It would appear that the men in the fort were not up to that time aware of the presence of the Sultān in the camp.

<sup>3</sup> Both the MSS. have *صلح*; but the lith. ed. has *بدامن صلح*. I have retained the last reading, as it has the correct oriental metaphor.

<sup>4</sup> Both MSS. have only *سردار*, but the lith. ed. has *دو سردار*. Here I have adopted the reading in the MSS.

commandant came in all haste to wait on the Sultān, and prayed for quarter. Sultān Maḥmūd on account of his great mercy, drew the pen of forgiveness over their guilt; and gave assurances of safety to all of them. When the commandant of the fort and the chiefs of the neighbouring country came and waited on the Sultān, he distinguished them all by bestowing robes of honour and favours on them. He then mounted his horse and went to inspect the fort. After he had finished the inspection, the commandant presented a large tribute. The Sultān bestowed the amount of the tribute on him in the same *majlis*; and also conferred on him a special robe of honour and a golden belt. He also fixed the amount of the annual tribute, and entrusted the defence and government of the country to the commandant. He then returned, with success and prosperity, and took up his abode in Aḥmadābād.

In the year 870 A.H., 1466 A.D., the Sultān went out hunting towards Aḥmadnagar. On the way Bahā'-ul-mulk, son of Alf Khān, killed Ādam Silāḥdār (trooper) without any apparent cause; and fled into the country of Īdar. <sup>1</sup> Sultān Maḥmūd sent Malik Hājī and Malik Kālū 'Aḍd-ul-mulk; and these men having gone a part of the way, allowed a falsehood to enter their minds; and <sup>2</sup> they induced two

<sup>1</sup> The readings are different here. One MS. has *عماد الملک و عضد الملک* با جماعت تعین نمود انها دو شخص بیگناه را آوردند و بانها قرار دادند که بگویند دو کس از نوکران بهاء الملک که the other MS. has *کاتل سلاحدار ما بودیم* را آوردند و بانها قرار دادند که بگویند ملک حاجی و ملک کالو عضد الملک را فرستاد و انها چو پاره راه رفتند ترویری بخاطر رسانیده دو کس از نوکران را برین آوردند که قاتل ادم سلاحدار ما بودیم. I have after comparing the three readings and that in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*, which contains more details, adopted the reading which appeared to me to be the best. In the text edition is *عضد الملک* instead of *ملک کالو عضد الملک*.

<sup>2</sup> According to *Firishtah*, they induced the two men by giving them some money *با جزوی مال فریفتند*. They also told them that the *bādshāh* was merciful, and would pardon them; and besides, he would not pass a sentence of death, without consulting them. The poor men, tempted by the money, and also actuated by good feeling towards their master, said as they had been taught. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* (Bayloy, p. 179) has a similar account, but it says that the men sent in pursnit of Bahā'-ul-mulk actually found him, but apparently let him go.

of the servants of Bahā'-ul-mulk, to say that they were the murderers of Ādam Silāḥdār; and returning from the way, they reported to the Sultān, that they had seized and brought the murderers of Ādam Silāḥdār, and they were confessing their guilt; and <sup>1</sup> Bahā'-ul-mulk had fled into the country of Īdar. Sultān Maḥmūd ordered that those two innocent men should be executed. After some days when the veil was raised from the face of the matter, and it was known for certain, that those two poor men were not the murderers of the Silāḥdār; and 'Imād-ul-mulk had by fraud and deceit induced them to confess, the Sultān ordered that 'Imād-ul-mulk and 'Aḍḍ-ul-mulk should also be executed; and all the property and villages left behind by them should be escheated to the *khālṣa* (the Sultān's treasury). Malik Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk was made 'Imād-ul-mulk; and the appointment of *nā'ib ghaibat* (regent in the Sultān's absence) was conferred on him; and all the soldiers of 'Imād-ul-mulk were made over to him.

<sup>2</sup> The Sultān marched out in the year 871 A.H. (1467 A.D.) to conquer the fort of Karnāl which is now known as Jūnāgarh. They

---

Bayloy says in a note that every copy of the *Mirāt-i-Sikandārī* says that the men sent in pursuit of Bahā'-ul-mulk actually found him; but he also quotes the *Tabakāt-i-Akbarī* to say that they returned after going a part of the way towards Īdar. According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandārī*, the two men were induced to confess, as they were told that the Sultān would sentence them to short terms of imprisonments, and they would be soon released at the intercession of those who asked them to confess. Rās Mālā and the Cambridge History of India do not mention the incident. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 51) refers to the incident "As an instance of the impartial justice of Mahmood Shah". It was impartial, as even great *amīrs* were not spared; but it is also an instance of a great miscarriage of justice. In the text-edition the reading adopted is: *دو شخص بیگناہ*.

<sup>1</sup> This sentence, which occurs in both MSS. and in the lith. ed., appears to be redundant, unless it is taken as part of the false report.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah says that in 871 A.H. the Sultān saw the Prophet Muḥammad in a dream, and that the latter bestowed on him two dishes of delicious viands. This was interpreted to mean that he would have two great gifts, viz., the conquest of the country of Diu, and the forthcoming conquest of Karnāl. There is no mention of it in the *Ṭabaqāt* and I cannot find any mention in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandārī* also. Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 355) has a slightly different version, and refers only to an invitation "to the conquest of infidels, by spreading before him, in a vision, a magnificent banquet of the most delicious viands."

say, that for nearly two thousand years, this country had been in the possession of the ancestors of Rāy<sup>1</sup> Mandalik. After Sultān Muḥammad Tughlaq Shāh and Sultān Aḥmad Shāh Gujrātī, the hand of the possession of no one else had reached this country. Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh advanced towards it, placing his trust in divine help and support, and in the course of the march he ravaged the country of Sōrath. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the hill of Karnāl, the inhabitants of the district placed their property and their families in distant places, and in hills filled with trees, and themselves took shelter in a strong place. Tughlaq Khān, who was descended from the Sultāns of Sind, and was the maternal uncle of the Sultān, informed the latter of this. On the following day the Sultān proceeded in that direction, as if hunting along the way. <sup>2</sup> In spite of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 53) says in a note that the Mandliks, as he writes the name, are "like dessoies, natgows, reddywars, zemindars and poligars so called in other parts of India". *Mandalika* is from *Mandala*, a circle or a part of a country, and means the lord of the *Mandala*. In the same note Col. Briggs on the authority of the Moontukhlīb-ool-Towareekh says that the name of this Mandalik was Humbur Ray. I cannot find his name anywhere else but the Cambridge History of India, page 305, calls him Mandalak Chūdāsama, but does not quote any authority; and Mandalak is certainly incorrect. It appears from a note in Bayley, page 183, that according to the Tārikh-i-Sōrath, Mandalik was also used as a proper name by the Raos of Girmūr (Karnāl).

<sup>2</sup> The meaning is not very clear, but it appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, page 184), that the Karnāl people, or the infidels of the country round, "gathered together their women and children and provisions, and went into the defile of Mahābala, which is an exceedingly strong position" (mahābūla means very strong). The Sultān "resolved to carry the place". Prince Tughlak (the Tughlaq Khān of the text) told the Sultān that it would be very difficult to seize the place. But the Sultān replied, "Please God, I will conquer it." "One day the Sultān mounted his horse to go hunting, and went in the direction of the Mahābala defile. When the Hindūs saw the small party, they took no heed to it. Suddenly the Sultān attacked them, and the infidels after a little fighting, fled into the jungle" (p. 185). Firishlah gives a somewhat different account. According to him, the Sultān, guided by Shāhzāda Tughlaq Khān, went with a selected body of warriors to the *darra* or defile of Mahābala, without the Hindūs knowing anything. The Rājputs, who were left to guard the place, and who were called Barāos, on becoming aware of the Sultān's approach fought bravely, but being unprepared and unarmed were all killed. Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 356) gives another version, according to which, the Sultān sent



difficulties of the paths and the entrances (probably passes), he succeeded in reaching that place; and after much effort and endeavour, the Rājput̃s fled, and threw themselves into the fort of Karnāl, by way of the hills and jungles. <sup>1</sup> Many prisoners and much property fell into the hands of the army. From that place the Sultān went towards the temple of the people. A body of Rājput̃s who are called *Par-dhāns* (*Pradhānas* or chiefmen), determining to die, placed their hands on their swords and lances inside the temple; and in the twinkling of an eye became food for the sword. The next day (the Sultān) started from that place, and encamped at the foot of the fort of Karnāl; and sent detachments to plunder and ravage the surrounding country. The Rāj Mandalik, in great humility and helplessness, asked for pardon of his offences; and sent a large tribute. <sup>2</sup> Sultān Maḥmūd, on account of the exigencies of the times, deferred the conquest of the fort to the next year, and treating the Mandalik with gentleness went back to Aḥmadābād.

In the year 872 A.H. (1468 A.D.), it was reported to the Sultān that the Rāj Mandalik on account of his haughtiness and pride had an umbrella held over his head; and placing valuable ornaments, on his <sup>3</sup> arms and neck sat in public. Immediately on hearing this news (the Sultān) appointed forty thousand horsemen with famous elephants to punish him. At the time of bidding adieu to them,

---

a detachment under Toghluk Khān "to occupy two outworks called Mohabilla. Tho Rajpoots who were entrusted with the post were surprised and cut off". The Cambridge History of India makes no reference to the matter.

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishtah they comprised the زنان و پسران درۀ مہابله i.e., the women and children of the men who had been left to defend the Mahābala defile.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah says that the Sultān agreed to receive tribute and to defer the conquest for another year, because immense quantities of valuable jewellery and other booty had fallen into the hands of the soldiers; and the weather having become very hot, it was impossible to continue longer in that hilly country.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. have کردن و گرفتن (unintelligible) in one, and کردن و دست in the other. Tho lith. ed. has simply برخود. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has دست و کردن, leaving out the middle word. Firishtah says plainly, that the Sultān was simply waiting for a pretext, and this report enabled him to undertake another expedition.

he told the *amīrs* and the heads of clans, that if the Mandalik came forward in the way of submission and fealty, and delivered up the umbrella and the valuable jewels, which on the days of idol worship he puts on his person, and pays the tribute which had already been fixed, they should not interfere in any way with his country. When the army of Gujrāt arrived near the country of the Mandalik, the commandant sent a body of men to him, and communicated to him (through them), what the Sultān had said. The Rāy Mandalik came forward to meet the emissaries with all respect; and sent to the *amīrs*, the umbrella and the jewels and valuable ornaments which on the days of worshipping the idols and on other auspicious days, he used to put on his person, together with a large tribute: and having tried to win their heart turned them back. When the *amīrs* (after their return) waited on the Sultān, and placed before him all the things which they had brought, the latter in his festive assembly and convivial meetings, <sup>1</sup> gave the things away to story-tellers and readers.

<sup>2</sup> In the year 873 A.H., 1469 A.D., the news of the death of Sultān Mahmūd Khalji, the ruler of Mālwa, came. The *amīrs* represented

---

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah quoting Nizām-ud-din, says the same thing in identical words: but because such prodigality appeared to him, as it certainly appears to me, to be somewhat incredible, ends with the pious ejaculation. *والله اعلم بالصواب* and i.e., God alone knows the truth. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 55) says in his translation, the Sultān distributed the money produced by this expedition, in one night, among a set of female dancers. He may be right, but *گویندگان و خواندگان* means story-tellers and readers, and not female dancers. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* (Bayley, p. 186) modifies the story a little, and says the Sultān distributed the garments among his musicians. Bayley in a note finds some kind of fault with Firishtah, and says the latter places this expedition in 872 A.H. It appears to me that Firishtah does nothing of the kind; he places this expedition before the occurrences of 873 A.H. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 55) however places this expedition in 874 A.H., which might have led to Bayley's mistake.

<sup>2</sup> This matter about the death of Sultān Mahmūd Khalji does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah. The Cambridge History of India, p. 305, mentions it, giving the 31st May, 1469, as the date of Sultān Mahmūd Khalji's death. It also refers to the discussion about the invasion of the country, and Sultān Mahmūd's refusal to undertake it; and then says that the Sultān "committed an act as wanton, by leading into Sorath a large army against the Mandalak of Gīrnār".

to Sultān Maḥmūd that at the time, when Sultān Muḥammad, the son of Aḥmad Shāh had accepted the summons of the just God, Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī arrived at the town of <sup>1</sup> Kaparbanj, intending to attempt the conquest of the country of Gujrāt. If the Lord of the world (meaning the Sultān) at this time, when the appliances for the conquest of the country are all at hand and ready, advances towards Mālwa, that country would come into his possession with very little effort. Sultān Maḥmūd declared, that it was not right in Islām and Musalmānī, that Musalmāns should fall out amongst themselves, and that people should be trampled down in the calamities which would occur. Besides, at this time, when the Sultān has died, and the affairs of the state have not been arranged, it would be removed from the rules of humanity and the customs of generosity to invade his country. He then left Aḥmadābād with the object of hunting, and having spent some days in the jungle, again took up his abode in Aḥmadābād.

In the year 874 A.H., he again sent armies to plunder and ransack the country of Sōrath; and within a short time, they returned after devastating the country, and bringing an enormous quantity of plunder. Among the great incidents of the year, one was this that Sultān Maḥmūd, mounted on an elephant, went towards <sup>2</sup> *Bāgh-i-Iram*. On the way <sup>3</sup> another *masī* elephant, having broken his chain turned on the Sultān's <sup>4</sup> retinue. The other elephants seeing it, turned their faces in flight, and it advanced on the elephant which the Sultān was riding. The latter after bearing two or three onsets, also fled; and when it was running away, the other elephants rushing forward, struck it (apparently with their tusks) on the shoulder; and the Sultān's leg was injured by its tusks and blood began to flow from it. At this

<sup>1</sup> کیرینج Kēryanj in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> Apparently some beautiful park or garden, called the garden of Paradise. Firishtah's account agrees with that in the text, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 55) gives a somewhat different account. He says that the Sultan was on a hunting excursion, and when he was attacked by the *masī* elephant, all his companions fled, etc.

<sup>3</sup> This word shows that the Sultān was also riding a *masī* elephant; and Firishtah says so, but neither the MSS. nor the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt* say that the Sultān was on a *masī* olophant.

<sup>4</sup> The word is *fauj*, apparently the Sultān's retinue or followers.

time, the Sultān with great bravery hurled a spear on the elephant's forehead. The blood was now flowing, but the elephant made another onset, and had another spear hurled at it. The blood now bubbled out of its forehead as from a fountain. The animal now trumpeted and gave another blow to the Sultān's elephant; but it received another spear with such force, that it had to turn tail and run away. The Sultān went to the palace with safety; and made all deserving persons happy by the distribution of votive offerings and <sup>1</sup> charities.

After a few days he summoned the *amīrs* of the marches, and with a well-equipped army advanced to conquer the fort of Jūnāgarh and the hill of Karnāl. He distributed five *krors* of gold in the course of a night and day among his soldiers; and included amongst these were two thousand and five *Turkī* and *'Iraqī* and *'Arab* horses, the prices of some of which amounted to as much as twelve thousand *tankas* each, which were bestowed on the men. He also distributed five thousand jewelled swords and seven hundred jewelled belts and one thousand and five daggers with gold and embossed scabbards. When he arrived in the country of Sōrath by successive rapid marches, he sent detachments in every direction to plunder and devastate (the country). Rāy Mandalik in a state of extreme humility and helplessness waited on him; and represented that this slave (he himself) had lived a whole life-time within the bounds of allegiance and fealty; and no act which might have the least suspicion of any breach of engagement or promise had been committed by him. He was also at the present moment prepared to pay any tribute which His Majesty might order. The Sultān said, "All my energies are at present directed to raise the standards of Islām in this country, after bringing it into my possession, so that the institutions of Islām might be established here. I have no other object in view, except the introduction of Islām and the capture of the fort."

<sup>2</sup> When Rāy Mandalik understood from the purport of these words, that this army with other armies was ready to conquer the

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have *خیرات*, charity, but the other MS. has *شکرانہ*, thanks offering.

<sup>2</sup> The meaning of the sentence, *این لشکر با لشکرهای دیگر نمی نماید* is not clear. The sentence is the same in both MSS. and in the lith. ed., except that

country, he waited for an opportunity; and fled at night and retired into the fort of Jūnāgarh. The next day the Sultān moved forward, and encamped close to the citadel of Jūnāgarh. One detachment separated from the army, and advanced on the fort. A body of Rājput̃s sallied out, and after fighting fled. The next day also there was some fighting; and on the third day the Sultān himself attacked the fort, and there was severe fighting from morning to evening. On the 4th day the Sultān's pavilion was raised near the gate, and the fort was closely besieged; and covered passages were laid down from all sides. The Rājput̃s at all times sallied out of the fort, and made violent attacks; and many good men were slain. For instance, they fell on a particular day on the battery of 'Alām Khān Fārūq̃, and made a martyr of him. Sultān Maḥmūd made the siege such a close one, that the stones thrown by the ballistas sometimes fell in front of the Sultān's throne. Although Rāj Mandalik made proposals of peace and of the payment of tribute, they had no effect whatever as the Sultān had determined on the conquest of the fort.

In the end, Rāj Mandalik, in his extreme humility and distress, prayed for mercy; and after surrendering the fort, took shelter with all his Rājput̃s in the hill of Karnāl. Sultān Maḥmūd performed the rite of offering thanks, and occupied himself with settling the affairs of the country. After some days, he laid siege to the hill of Karnāl. In the end, Rāj Mandalik, having no other alternative,

joined the service of the Sultān; and having prayed for the safety of his men, surrendered the hill of Karnāl also. <sup>1</sup>After this, as he for several days went every day and waited on the Sultān, and observed his pleasant manners and his praise-worthy morals, he submitted one day, that from the auspicious effect of the society of Shāh Shams-ud-din Darvish, the love of Islām and of Musalmāns had had a great effect on his mind; and now that he had been attending on the Sultān, and had become cognizant of the truth of the faith of Islām, he wished that he should join the Musalmān community. Sultān Muḥmūd with great eagerness taught him the creed of the unity of God, and conferred the title of Khān Jahān on him. And in order that the institutions of Islām should be current in that country, he laid the (first) brick for building the city of Muṣṭafā-ābād in the ground; and he ordered all the *amīrs* that they should lay the foundations of mansions for their residence there. In a short time, the city of Muṣṭafā-ābād became a model of Aḥmadābād.

When the *amīrs* and the soldiers took up their residence in Muṣṭafā-ābād, everywhere where there were thieves and disturbers of the peace round about Aḥmadābād, they raised their heads and began to commit thefts and highway robberies; and the roads, by which people went about from place to place, became closed. When this news reached Sultān Muḥmūd, he conferred the title of Muḥāfiẓ Khān on Malik Jamāl-ud-din, son of Shaikh Malik, who was <sup>2</sup>the *kōṭwāl* of the camp (provost-marshal), and who was entrusted with

<sup>1</sup> The *Marāt-i-Sikandari* (Bayley, p. 190) gives another version of the story of the conversion of Rāo Mundalik. According to this, he went in attendance on the Sultān to Aḥmadābād. One day he went to Rasūlābād, where his Holiness Shāh 'Alam lived, and is buried. He saw many horses and elephants and men assembled there, and inquired what *amīr* lived there. He was told that His Holiness Shāh 'Alam resided there. He went and saw him, and was converted by him. It may be mentioned here as an extremely curious fact that according to Rūs Mālī, Rāo Mundaleek, who was throughout his life so unremittingly persecuted by the Musalmāns, was as Khān Jahān worshipped under the guise of a Muslim saint, by the descendants of the men who had persecuted him, at his tomb in Aḥmadabad, up to the time, when Rūs Mālī was published in 1856, and may be worshipped up to the present day. (See Rūs Mālī, vol. I, page 357.)

<sup>2</sup> The word *کوٹوال* appears to me to be incorrect, although it is found in the MSS., and also in the lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of Firishah. I would rather insert the word *عہدہ* before *کوٹوال*, or change *کوٹوال* to *کوٹوالی*.

the supervision of the *silāh khāna* (stores of arms and ammunition), and gave him a standard and a <sup>1</sup> trumpet; and sent him to Aḥmadābād after investing him with the post of *shahna* and *kotwāl* (Superintendent of manners and morals and of police) of that place.

Malik Jamāl-ud-dīn, Muḥāsif Khān put the city of Aḥmadābād into such order as the heart could wish for, within a short time; and had five hundred thieves hanged. As this work of his met with the approbation of the Sultān, he had other appointments conferred on him; and the office of the *istīfā'-i-mumālīk* was added to his other offices; and <sup>2</sup> gradually his affairs reached to such a position, that one thousand and seven hundred horses were collected in his stables;

---

<sup>1</sup> The word is طاس in both MSS., and قرطاس in the lith. ed. Firishtah has كرناء instead.

<sup>2</sup> The whole of the passage about the appointment of Malik Jamāl-ud-dīn, and the increase of his power down to the end of the paragraph is copied almost *verbatim* by Firishtah; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 57) in his translation makes certain changes. Instead of the 1,700 horses in his stable he mentions 1,700 "bargeer-khass", or persons equipped by him, and riding his own stable horses. He also says that his powers were so little under control, that his son, "in the absence of the king, marched without orders, and obliged the Rajs of Idar, Wagur and Serohy, to pay him tribute". This might have been correct; but neither Nizām-ud-dīn nor Firishtah explicitly says so. According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* (Bayley, page 192), "His son exacted tribute from the rebellious chiefs who had never paid it before". It appears also from a note on the same page that there is probably some MS. of Firishtah, which contains statements identical with those made by Col. Briggs. Bayley however quotes from Col. Briggs, and attributes the statement of Firishtah (see the note \*, page 194). The *Cambridge History of India* (page 306) says something quite different. According to it, while Mahmūd "was besieging Girnūr, Jai Singh, the son of Gangādās of Chāmpūnēr had been committing systematic brigandage and highway robbery in the country between his stronghold and Aḥmadābād. He therefore sent Jamāl-ud-dīn Muhammad, conferring on him the title of Muḥāsif Khān to govern this tract, and he put down thieving and highway robbery with such a firm hand, that the inhabitants, we are told slept with open doors". This is not quite correct, Malik Jamāl-ud-dīn, or Muḥāsif Khān was appointed *kōtwāl* and *shahna* of the city of Aḥmadābād, and not governor of the country between that city and Chāmpūnēr. There is nothing said in any of the histories of any connection between Jai Singh and the thieves and robbers, except that he allowed the rebels of Barōda and Dabhoi to pass through his territory; and Malik Jamāl-ud-dīn is not said to have had anything to do with him except that he waited on the Sultān, when the latter was marching against Jai Singh, and was appointed the *vazīr*.

and wherever there was a good soldier, he was included among his retainers. His power and splendour reached such a height, that his son Malik *Khidr* extorted tribute from the Rājas of Bākar and Īdar and Sirohī.

In the beginning of 876 A.H., 1471 A.D., it was reported to the Sultān that Jai Singh, the son of Gangdās Rāja of Chāmpānīr, having become proud by the help and patronage of Sultān *Ghiyāth-ud-dīn* of Mālwa, had allowed the rebels of Barōda and Dabōhī, a passage through his territory, and had the disposition of raising a rebellion. The Sultān marched from Muṣṭafā-ābād, and advanced to punish him. On the way, Muḥāfiẓ *Khān* had the honour of waiting upon him; and the appointment of *vazīr* was added to that of *kōṭwāl*. He left his deputies to perform the duties of the *kōṭwāl*, and occupied himself with the affairs of the *vazārat*.

When the Sultān heard of the disturbances created by the *zamīndārs* of Kach (Cutch); and their persecution of the Musalmāns was reported to him, the Sultān gave up the determination to conquer Chāmpānīr, and marched against that country with a large army. When he arrived <sup>1</sup> on the edge of the saline country, which is known as the Ran, he made a very rapid march and in the course of one day traversed a distance of <sup>2</sup> sixty *karōḥs*. Out of his total army, not more than <sup>3</sup> six hundred horsemen were with him at the end of the

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah has *موسوم برانست بجای رسید که موسوم ست بشور* instead of *موسوم برانست*, which Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 80) has translated as "came suddenly upon the enemy's encampment at Sheevur". It appears from Firishtah that this part of Cutch was contiguous to Sind, and was inhabited by people whom he calls *ماجینان* Mājīnān. According to the Cambridge History of India, page 306, the place is what is now known as the Thār and Parkār district.

<sup>2</sup> There is some doubt as to the possibility of a march of this length, in the course of one day, as in the text, or a *شبانہ روز*, or a night and a day as in Firishtah. though Bayley, quoting Col. Briggs, makes it "without a halt". in a note on page 193; and comes to the conclusion, that it is impossible to cover the distance in one day, but it is possible though hardly likely to do so in one day and night. I should note here also that both MSS. have sixty *karōḥs* as the length of the march, but the lith. ed. has sixty-one *karōḥs*; and it appears from the note in Bayley that the MS. which he had had sixty-one *karōḥs*.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. has six hundred horsemen, but the other MS. has three hundred. Firishtah lith. ed. has six hundred, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV,



march. When he reached the other side of that dangerous country, the enemy could be seen before them. They say that there were twenty-four thousand archers. The Sultān, in spite of the fact that he had such a small number of men, and the enemy were in such large numbers, dismounted and armed himself. When the enemy saw the boldness and gallantry of the Sultān, they <sup>1</sup> came forward with sincerity; and made excuses for their offences. The Sultān drew the pen of forgiveness across their offences, and made peace with them, after taking a large subsidy. He also took some of their chiefs with him to Mustafa-ābād, and taught them the tenets of Islām and Musālmānī; and making everyone of them happy with largesses and favours gave them permission to go back. He granted a suitable *jāgīr* to each one of them, and retained those in his service who of their own free will chose to remain with him.

In the year 877 A.H. (1472 A.D.), it was reported to the Sultān, that forty thousand turbulent and refractory archers had collected together in the neighbourhood of the country of Sind, and <sup>2</sup> were harassing (the inhabitants of) the towns and villages on the border. He equipped an army and again turned in that direction. When he

p. 58) has "only three hundred cavalry". He makes the enemy consist of four thousand archers, though Firishṭah like Niẓām-ud-dīn has twenty-four thousand. The Cambridge History of India, page 306, gives the correct number, but makes them horse (horsemen) instead of archers.

<sup>1</sup> Firishṭah's account of what happened, when the Sultān with his six hundred horsemen met the archers, agrees generally with that in the text, but he says that the hostile men became confused and frightened and the chiefs came forward with swords and shrouds hanging from their necks. Col. Briggs has a somewhat different account. He says they were defeated, and numbers of them were slain, after which the remainder came forward with their weapons slung round their necks to implore for mercy. The accounts in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* (Bayley, p. 194) and the Cambridge History of India (p. 306) agree generally with that in the text; but Bayley quotes in a note Col. Briggs's account and attributes it to Firishṭah.

<sup>2</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 306, has forty thousand "rebels had risen against Jām Niẓām-ud-dīn, the ruler of Sind", but neither the *Tabaqāt* nor Firishṭah nor the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* mentions Jām Niẓām-ud-dīn. On the contrary they say that 40,000 men were harassing the residents of the parts of Gujrāt adjacent to their country.



some with his two sons with their heads and feet bare and waited on the Sultān; and submitted that they had embarked in a ship to go from the Deccan to Samargand; and were sailing towards Hormuz (Ormuz); that when they arrived opposite to Jagat, a body of men came out in boats filled with weapons of war, blocked their way, plundered them, and carried away the women and children of the Musalmāns into imprisonment. <sup>1</sup> Among them he and his sons had also been imprisoned. Sultān Mahmūd showed kindness to the Maulānā, and sent him to Ahmadābād, and fixed an allowance on him. At the time of bidding him farewell, he told him, "You rest assured, that whatever has been taken from you will be returned to you in its original condition; and those men will receive condign punishment". Then incited by his sense of shame, and his desire to help (Musalmāns), he sent for the *amīrs* and the chiefs of the different sections to attend on him; and said to them. "If on the day on which inquest will be made of our actions, they ask me, 'In your neighbourhood the *kāfirs* committed such oppression, and in spite of your having the power to stop it, you procrastinated', what reply shall I give?". The *amīrs* opened their lips for prayer and praise; and <sup>2</sup> said, "These slaves have nothing to do except to carry out your orders; and the destruction of these people is incumbent and due on our spirits".

The Sultān being confirmed in his determination, moved on the 16th Dhi-hijjah of that year towards <sup>3</sup> Jagat; and when with very great hardship on account of the narrowness of the way, and the dense jungle, they arrived at Jagat, the infidels fled to the island

---

him as "a man skilled in the rules and practice of poetry". The Cambridge History of India, page 306, calls him a learned poet and merchant. Bayley interprets the sentence, I think incorrectly, by saying that Maulānā Muhammad's literary name or *nom de plume* was Füzili.

<sup>1</sup> According to Firishtah the Maulānā told the Sultān that his wife was still in the custody of the *Kāfirs*. According to Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 196. "the pirates turned the Mullā (as he is called there) and his two sons adrift, but kept his women, his property and the ship". As the boys were of tender age, the Mullā had to carry them by turns, and in this way he traversed the distance of seventy *kōs*, and came to the Sultān.

<sup>2</sup> According to Firishtah the *amīrs* were tired of the annual expeditions undertaken by the Sultān.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. inserts بَندر, port, before Jagat. جَکَت Jakat in the text-edition.

<sup>1</sup> of Beyt. Many snakes appeared there. At the place where the Sultān's pavilion had been put up, seven hundred snakes were killed in the space of one *pahar*. <sup>2</sup> Many tigers and lions and wolves caused much loss to the men in the island; and many of the wild animals were also killed. They ravaged the temple of Jagat, and pulled it down. Sultān Maḥmūd had to wait there for four months at this place; and during this time many boats were prepared to carry the soldiers and the artillery; and then they started for the island of Beyt. The men in the island embarked in boats, and advanced to fight; but in the end, they retreated to the island. The brave warriors (of the Sultān's army) drove the ships, and threw themselves into the island; and having captured the citadel of Beyt, slew a vast number of Rājput̃s. The Rāja of the place, who had the name of Rāy Bhīm, got into a boat, and fled to some place. The Sultān embarked a number of his men in boats, and sent them in pursuit of him. He himself entered the city of Beyt, and released all the Musalmāns who were imprisoned there. He got much plunder and an enormous number of prisoners of war. He left Malik Ṭūghān, who had the title of Farḡat-ul-mulk, as the *thānadār* of the place, and crowned with success and victory <sup>3</sup> returned to Muṣṭafa-ābād. On Friday the 13th of

---

<sup>1</sup> Both MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishṭah have بیت, Byet, but the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt has شکوندنار, Shakūndhār. The two appear to be names of the same island.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS., as well as the lith. ed. have شیر و ببر و پلنگ. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 61) has lions, leopards and wolves. As to the number of snakes killed, Firishṭah (lith. ed.) also says that seven hundred were killed in the course of one *pahar*. Col. Briggs, however, has seventy killed in a day; and says in a note that the number would not appear to be exaggerated to any one who has been in India. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari also says that seven hundred snakes were killed in one night within the royal enclosure. According to the Cambridge History of India (p. 307) the Sultān moved from Jagat or Dwārakā to Arūmrah, at the extreme N.W. point of the peninsula, and it was here, that the army was troubled by lions and venomous snakes and insects. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 196) mentions the village of Arūmrah; and Bayley says in a note that the name is variously spelt in the different MSS.

<sup>3</sup> According to Firishṭah, Rāy Bhīm was seized and brought before the Sultān before the latter left for Muṣṭafa-ābād; and he was taken to that place. At Muṣṭafa-ābād the Sultān ordered that a letter be written to the Maulānā; but while the letter was being written he arrived; and his wife and children were

Jamīdī-ul-āwwal of the aforementioned year, the men who had gone in pursuit of Rāy Bhīm brought him under arrest and in fetters, and made him stand in front of the Sultān's hall of audience. The Sultān sent for Maulānā Muḥammad Samarkandī from Aḥmadābād, and sent the wretched and miserable Bhīm Rāy to Muḥāfiẓ Khān, so that he might cut him up into four strips, and hang them up at the four sides of the city of Aḥmadābād, so that other turbulent men might be terrified by the sight.

<sup>1</sup> In the month of Rajab of that year (874 A.H.), the Sultān left a number of his officers at Muṣṭafa-ābād, and started towards the fort of Chāmpānūr. On the way he received the news that a body

made over to him. Rāy Bhīm was also made over to him, to do what he liked with him; and the Maulānā asked the Sultān, that he should be made over to Muḥāfiẓ Khān, and should be taken round the city and killed with torture. Col. Briggs's account is slightly different. The Cambridge History of India does not say that the Maulānā's wife and children were returned to him; but he was asked to identify his property out of the immense quantity of plunder and he was given all that he identified, besides some big presents. Raja Bhīm was also made over to him but he returned the raja, and he was sent to Ahmadābād, and impaled (p. 307).

<sup>1</sup> The account of this incident as given in Firishtah (lith. ed.) does not differ materially from the text. The date is ٨٨٧ مائة رجب سنة سبع و ثمانمائة in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, which is defective as in the words, the word for the tens is omitted. In figures the year is 887, and in Col. Briggs's translation the year is 887 A.H. and 1482 A.D. In the Cambridge History of India, page 307, the attack on the Malabar pirates is said to have taken place between October 1473 and January 1474, i.e., about 8 years before the date given by Col. Briggs. The correct year would be 877 A.H., ٨٧٧ مائة و سبعة و سبعين, as given in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. There are some details in Firishtah not mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn such as the fact that the Sultān's men were armed with *توپ و تفنگ و تیر و کمان*. Col. Briggs's account (vol. IV, p. 65) differs a great deal. He calls the Mālābārians Bulsar pirates, and he says that they had gained such an ascendancy at sea, as to threaten the invasion of his dominions; and had already intercepted the trade. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī's (Bayley, p. 199) account is different, as it does not appear from it that the Sultān himself embarked on board his ships, and a battle was fought with the pirates; but Bayley in a note quotes the Tabakāt about the Sultān having commanded the fleet and fought a battle. He also says that according to Firishtah the pirates were of Bulsar. The Cambridge History of India, page 307, says that the Malabar pirates made a descent on his coasts.

of <sup>1</sup> Malābārīs had collected a large number of boats and were harassing people travelling by sea. Immediately on hearing this news, (the Sultān) arranged some ships, and himself, with a body of brave warriors, embarked in them; and relying on divine help and victory lifted the anchors. When they arrived near the ships of the Malābārīs, the latter fled, and some of their boats fell into his hands. He then sailed to the port of Kanbāyat, and disembarked there. He returned to the capital city of Aḥmadābād in the month of Sha'bān. <sup>2</sup> At the end of Ramaḍān, he raided a part of the country of Chāmpānīr, and again returned to Aḥmadābād.

<sup>3</sup> In the year 875 A.H. the Sultān sent Malik Bahā'-ud-dīn 'Imād-ul-mulk to the *thāna* in the town of <sup>4</sup> Sonkhir, and Qawām-ul-mulk to that in the town Kodhrā, Farḥat-i-mulk to the *thāna* at fort Beyt, and Jagat, and Malik Nizām-ul-mulk to the *thāna* at <sup>5</sup> Kiz; and

<sup>1</sup> بیاریان traders in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> This sentence is to be found in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but is omitted from the other MS. The Sultān is said to have returned to Aḥmadābād according to both the MSS. and the lith. ed., but it is more likely that he went to Muṣṭafa-ābād.

<sup>3</sup> Nizām-ud-dīn does not give the reasons of these appointments. It appears from Firishtah that the people (*amīrs*?) were tired of the continual expeditions of the Sultān; and with the order to change their residence from Aḥmadābād to Muṣṭafa-ābād; and were in a mood to rebel. So the Sultān made these appointments so that the *amīrs* might keep their *thānas* in order, and he himself might have the leisure to organise the administration of the newly acquired territory of Karnāl or Sōrath. Col. Briggs says briefly that the Shah conceived his dominions to be too extensive for his own immediate management. The Cambridge History of India also refers to the tireless energy and ceaseless activity of the Sultān which had become wearisome to his soldiers and officers. I may point out here that the Cambridge History of India, page 307, suddenly jumps, in the course of about half a dozen lines, from January 1474 to December 1480.

<sup>4</sup> سونگھر in the text-edition.

<sup>5</sup> This name is کیز in one MS., is illegible in the other, and کنیر Kanīr in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is مین Maiz. According to Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 62), Nizam-ool-Moolk was sent to Tanna. The Cambridge History of India does not give the names of the governors and of their stations. تھانیسر in the text-edition.

appointed <sup>1</sup> *Khudāwand Khān* to be the *vazīr* of the kingdom, and left him in attendance on Shāh-zāda Aḥmad Khān at Aḥmadābād. He occupied himself with the administration of Jūnāgarh and the surrounding country.

One day *Khudāwand Khān*, owing to his sincere attachment and intimacy with the Rāy <sup>2</sup> Rāyān, told him in private “<sup>3</sup> I am much aggrieved at the many activities of Sultān Maḥmūd. Not a single year or a month passes, that he does not take up an enterprise and does not march the army about. If with your own men, and taking five hundred of my soldiers with you, you go to the house of ‘Imūd-ul-mulk and get him out of the way, we can to-morrow raise Shāh-zāda

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah says *Khudāwand Khān*, who was the *vazīr*, was made the *atāliq* or guardian of Shāh-zāda Muẓaffar Khān, and was left at Aḥmadābād. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 62) calls him Khodabanda Khan “preceptor of the Prince Moozuffur Khan”. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* agrees with the *Ṭabaqūt*; and Bayley in a note says that the *Ṭabakūt* and the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* are correct as to the name of the prince; but he says that Firishtah says that *Khudābandah Khān* was made governor of Aḥmadābād, which is certainly not correct. But Bayley always means Col. Briggs when he says Firishtah. According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, *Khudāwand Khān* was induced by some designing men to acquiesce in the conspiracy (Bayley, p. 201).

<sup>2</sup> His name does not appear, but as his title implies, and as the Cambridge History of India (p. 308) says, he was the chief Hindu noble.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah does not give the conversation between *Khudāwand Khān* and the Rāy Rāyān, but goes on at once to say that they sent for ‘Imūd-ul-mulk and other nobles to Aḥmadābād, and after swearing ‘Imūd-ul-mulk on the *Qurān* made them join the conspiracy. ‘Imūd-ul-mulk joined it, as he did not have his soldiers with him. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*’s account is very brief; and Bayley considered the account in the *Ṭabakūt* had such details, and the matter was of such importance, as explaining the reasons why Prince Aḥmad was passed over, that he has incorporated a translation of it in his book. I find, however, that his translation is not quite correct, if he made it from a text which was identical with mine; for instance he says that *Khudāwand Khān* told Rāy Rāyān, if I were to take my own followers and five hundred soldiers to ‘Imūd-ul-mulk’s house, I could easily get him out of the way.

The account of the conspiracy as given in the Cambridge History of India, page 308, agrees with that in the text, except that it says that the Rāy Rāyān refused to be a party to ‘Imūd-ul-mulk’s death. I do not know whether he would have actually refused; but all that the text says is that he believed that he would be able to gain him over, and that the conspirators would be all the stronger by his joining them.

Aḥmad K̲h̲ān to the *saḷṭanat*. For killing ‘Imād-ul-mulk, we will not have a better time (than this), when all his retainers have gone to his *thāna*. I have submitted this matter to Shāhzāda Aḥmad K̲h̲ān; and he agrees with me, and is willing to join us”. The Rāy Rāyān said, “‘Imād-ul-mulk is sincerely attached to me, and tells me all his private matters. As he is also aggrieved with the Sultān, and has complaints against him, it is extremely likely that he would join with us in this matter, and by his union with us, our plans will acquire a new strength. Although K̲h̲udāwand K̲h̲ān forbade the Rāy Rāyān to communicate with ‘Imād-ul-mulk, it was of no avail. The Rāy Rāyān, relying on the friendship and affection of ‘Imād-ul-mulk, at first swore him in private on the *Qurān*, that he would not disclose this secret, and later brought the matter into discussion. As ‘Imād-ul-mulk saw that his men had gone to his *jāgīr*, on the spur of the moment he signified his consent, and said, “In this matter I am at one with K̲h̲udāwand K̲h̲ān; but it appears to me that as Ramaḍān is drawing to a close, we should attempt to carry out our intention after it is over”. The Rāy Rāyān was pleased (with this suggestion); and communicated the message to K̲h̲udāwand K̲h̲ān.

After the Rāy Rāyān had gone away, ‘Imād-ul-mulk sent for <sup>1</sup> Malik Miyān to come to him in private; and said to him, “In Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn’s time, I used to desire that I might have a second horse, and I could not have it; and now owing to the greatness of Sultān Maḥmūd, there is not a greater man than myself in his service”. He immediately wrote a letter to <sup>2</sup> Malik Farḥat-ul-mulk, who had encamped in the town of Sarkhēj, and asked him to come and meet him. He also sent a letter to Malik Qāyām-ul-mulk at <sup>3</sup> Rakhīāl, that he should not march from that place for some days. Early the next morning, Malik Farḥat-ul-mulk arrived at ‘Imād-ul-mulk’s house with five hundred horsemen. They had an interview for a little while; and then Malik Farḥat-ul-mulk was sent to his own house. After a time ‘Imād-ul-mulk sent for Muḥāfiẓ K̲h̲ān the *kōṭwāl* of the city, and said to him, “As there is relationship between us it is right

<sup>1</sup> فرزندیان in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> Contrary to this, Firishtah says he sent for his own troops.

<sup>3</sup> The name of the place is printed as Rakhīāl by Bayley also, but he has (?) after it (p. 203). رکھيال in the text-edition.



that we should <sup>1</sup> endeavour to do good to each other. Your loyalty consists in your being present to attend to the affairs of the city, lest a disturbance should be created. On the day of the 'Īd, you should be ready with your followers and retainers, and attend on Prince Ahmad Khān at the <sup>2</sup> *maṣlā*; and till midday you should make every endeavour to guard the city".

Khudāwand Khān on hearing the words (the news ?) became anxious in his mind. He sent for Rāy Rāyān to his presence, and said (to him), "Did I not tell you, that 'Imād-ul-mulk would not agree with us in this matter. Now things have come to such a pass, that all our houses (families) would be ruined". When the 'Īd passed off, and 'Imād-ul-mulk's retainers all arrived, <sup>3</sup> Khudāwand Khān did not for fear (or consequences) disclose (his intentions); and his resolution remained in this way unaccomplished. It so happened, however, that after some days, <sup>4</sup> a popular rumour reached Muṣṭafa-ābād that Khudāwand Khān had killed 'Imād-ul-mulk on the day of the 'Īd, and all the *amīrs* had joined with him, and they had placed Shāhzāda Ahmad Khān on the throne. One of the (*amīrs*), who were with the Sultān, went with some audacity, and without any hesitation repeated the rumour to him.

<sup>1</sup> The translation in Bayley, page 203, is "we must rival each other in loyalty". This does not appear to me to be correct.

خير خواهي does not mean loyalty (to the Sultān); but in the next sentence apparently means loyalty to him.

<sup>2</sup> I do not know what the meaning of *مصل* is. The translation in Bayley, page 203, does not say where he was to go in attendance on prince Ahmad Khān.

<sup>3</sup> The sentence یکی از مقربان گستاخ رفتہ بی تعاشی این خبر بسطان is somewhat cryptic; but the corresponding sentence in Firishtah which is وقیصر خان کہ از امرای مقرب سلطان بود و در مصطفی آباد خبر اراجیف و رسانید makes the meaning clear.

<sup>4</sup> According to Firishtah the rumour reached Muṣṭafa-ābād: and Qaisar Khān secretly communicated it to the Sultān, and the latter determined on making a secret investigation. The Cambridge History of India, page 308, says "Qaisar Khān Fārūqī, who was at Ahmadābād, privately informed the king of the affair, so that it came to naught". It does not appear, however, that Qaisar Khān was at Ahmadābād, or that he knew the real facts; and the Sultān did not know them till some time afterwards, when he got 'Imād-ul-mulk to divulge them.

<sup>1</sup> Immediately on hearing this news, the Sultān sent for Qaiṣar Khān and Firūz Khān to his private chamber and said, "The news of the illness of the Shāhizāda had come before this, and to-day my mind is very sad as to what has happened to him. Go out a distance of two *karōhs*, and come back with correct and detailed news from anyone (when you may meet), who should be coming from Aḥmadābād. When <sup>2</sup> Malik Sa'id-ul-mulk had gone a part of the way, he saw one of his own relations, who was coming from Aḥmadābād. He asked him how things were there. He said I was in Aḥmadābād on the day of the <sup>3</sup> 'Īd-i-Fiṭr. The Shāhizāda came to make his *namāz*, and Khmdāwand Khān and Muhāfiz Khān were in attendance at the *darbār*. When the Shāhizāda went back to the palace, Muhāfiz Khān was present at the *darbār*, till two *pahars* of the day had passed. But the men of the city say that 'Imād-ul-mulk does not give his permission that the *amīrs* should go to their *thānas*; and they are all at their houses. Malik Sa'id-ul-mulk came back, and reported all that he heard. The Sultān said, "A man had told me a falsehood, to the effect that the Shāhizāda had been ill". After two or three days he sent for Qaiṣar Khān and Firūz Khān into his private chamber, and having told them the whole <sup>4</sup> story, said, "I will tell people that I intend to go on a pilgrimage to the *Hijāz*. Whoever approves of this determination of mine, I shall know that he does not want me". After some days he gave orders that ships should be made ready, and he gave some *lakhs* of *tankas* to the superintendent of the ship, so that he might buy things that would be required in Mecca for devotional offerings. He then went from Muṣṭafa-ābād to the port

<sup>1</sup> The account in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* (Bayley, p. 205) agrees with the text; but Firishtah and the *Cambridge History of India*, page 308, without giving any of the intermediate incidents, at once go on to say that the Sultān wanted to give out that he was going on a pilgrimage to Mecca.

<sup>2</sup> According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 204, the Sultān told Kaisar Khān and Firoz Khān to send Malik Sa'd-ul-Mulk to find out the true facts. The name is Sa'd-ul-mulk in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt* in one place, and Sa'id-ul-mulk in another, but it is Sa'id-ul-mulk in both MSS.

<sup>3</sup> The 'Īd of the opening or breaking of the fast of Ramaḍān, which takes place on the 1st Shawwāl.

<sup>4</sup> It is not clear how he got hold of it, or how much he knew.

of <sup>1</sup> Ghōghra, embarked in the boats; and disembarked at the port of Kanbāyat.

When this news reached Ahmadābād, all the *amīrs* <sup>2</sup> hastened to wait on the Sultān. The latter said that the Shāhzāda had come to a good age (*buzurg shudak*); and the *amīrs* have been trained as the heart might desire. "My mind is composed about the welfare of the kingdom, and it has occurred to me that I should now obtain the happiness of the *Haj*". 'Imād-ul-mulk said, "Your Majesty should go once to Ahmadābād, and then do whatever may appear to be proper". The Sultān knew that the <sup>3</sup> cup is only half filled; and proceeded towards Ahmadābād. When he arrived in the city, he sent one day for all the *amīrs*, and said, "Please give me permission that I might come back after performing the *Haj*; as long as you do not give a reply, <sup>4</sup> I shall not have any desire for food". The *amīrs* knew that the Sultān was testing them. All of them placed the seal of silence on their mouths. When the great luminary reached the meridian, 'Imād-ul-mulk said to the *amīrs*, "The Sultān is hungry, some reply should be given to him". <sup>5</sup> Nizām-ul-mulk went and waited

<sup>1</sup> The name is کبوک in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah and the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* agree; but the Cambridge History of India, page 308, says that the nobles were summoned from Ahmadābād to Cambay to consider this proposal, i.e., the proposal of the Sultān that he should go on a pilgrimage.

<sup>3</sup> The sentence in both MSS., and the lith. ed. is که درین کاسه نیم کاسه هست. Firishtah has a slightly different sentence مکہ زیر کاسه نیم کاسه هست.

<sup>4</sup> This is a curious and very early instance of a hunger strike.

<sup>5</sup> Both the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* and the Cambridge History of India make Nizām-ul-Mulk the spokesman of the *amīrs*, and attribute the speech to him; but Firishtah assigns it to 'Imād-ul-mulk. Nizām-ul-mulk is called in the Cambridge History of India (p. 308) Nizām-ul-Mulk Aisan; and is described as the oldest courtier. It would appear, however, that Firishtah is right, and the others are wrong. The fact that 'Imād-ul-mulk suggested to Nizām-ul-mulk later, that as he was the oldest, he should go to the Sultān confirms it. This also appears from Firishtah. If Nizām-ul-mulk had first gone to the Sultān there would be no necessity to ask him to go a second time on the ground that he was the oldest of the *amīrs*. Besides it is not likely that the Sultān would have said to Nizām-ul-mulk, that the government of the country could not go on in his absence. He could have only said this to 'Imād-ul-mulk. As to the name of Nizām-ul-mulk I have not seen it with the affix Aisan anywhere else; but in



of the good fortune of circumambulating (the sacred places)". (The Sultān) said, "If God so wills, it comes to pass". He then sent for his food, and partook of it. But he summoned Qaiṣar Khān into his private chamber, and said, "Imād-ul-mulk does not tell me the truth. I have determined that I shall not speak to him till he discloses the truth".

When a few days passed in this way, one day Imād-ul-mulk said to the Sultān in private, "This slave does not know what offence he has committed". The Sultān replied, "Until you tell the truth I shall not speak to you". He replied, "They made me swear on the *Qurān*". The Sultān said, "If in the discharge of your loyal duties, your life goes, you should say: let it go". Imād-ul-mulk then having no other alternative reported the whole of the truth. Sultān Maḥmūd acted with great forbearance; the only penalty which he inflicted on Khudāwand Khān was this, that he gave the name of Khudāwand Khān to one of his <sup>1</sup> pigeons. After a time he went to Nahrwāla; and from that place he sent Imād-ul-mulk to conquer Jālōr and <sup>2</sup> Sājōr; and he sent Qaiṣar Khān with him. Imād-ul-mulk on receiving leave to go, encamped near the tomb of Shaikh Hājī Rajab, may his soul be sanctified! In the night <sup>3</sup> Mujāhid Khān, son of Khudāwand Khān, in concert with Ṣāhib Khān his cousin, came out of his house, and entered the pavilion of Qaiṣar Khān, and murdered

<sup>1</sup> The word کبوتران, pigeons, is printed نوکران, servants, in the lith. ed.: and Col. Briggs apparently having نوکران in the MSS., from which he made his translation, has turned the humorous and whimsical punishment of Khudāwand Khān, whom, by the way, he always calls Khodabunda Khan into a matter of disgrace to the latter, by causing the person employed in the meanest office of his household to be called by his name. Bayley on page 205 says that the Sultān called one of his pigeons Khudāwand Khān; but, as usual, in a note he attributes Col. Briggs's statement to Firishah.

<sup>2</sup> The name is written ساجور in both MSS., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishah; but it is سانجور in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. Col. Briggs (vol. IV. p. 64) has Julwara and Aboogur in place of Jālōr and Sājōr. Bayley (p. 203) has Jālōr and Sājōr; but the Cambridge History of India, page 309, has "Sāncher and Jālōr in Marwār".

<sup>3</sup> Firishah agrees that the murder was committed by a son and a nephew of Khudāwand Khān; but the Cambridge History of India, page 309, says that it was committed by his two sons.

him. Early in the morning, 'Imād-ul-mulk went to wait on the Sultān and disclosed the truth to him. Another man, however, reported (to the Sultān) that Azdar Khān, son of Alf Khān, had committed this heinous act. The Sultān immediately, on hearing this, sent Firūz Khān that he should arrest and bring Azdar Khān. When night came, Mujāhid Khān and Šāhib Khān fled with their family and children. In the morning, when it became known that Azdar Khān was innocent, and Mujāhid Khān and Šāhib Khān had murdered Qaiṣar Khān, the Sultān ordered that Khudāwand Khān should be put in chains, and should be made over to Muḥāfiẓ Khān; and Azdar Khān should be set at liberty. After some days the Sultān returned to Aḥmadābād; and about this time the poor 'Imād-ul-mulk bound up the goods of existence (died). The Sultān took pity on his family, and gave his eldest son, who had the name of <sup>1</sup>Malik Bاده, the title of Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk; and he transferred the duty of the *vazārat* to Muḥāfiẓ Khān.

In the <sup>2</sup>year 880 A.H., the people of Gujrāt suffered the privations of a failure of the rains and a famine. It so happened, that <sup>3</sup>Malik

<sup>1</sup> See note 1, pp. 269, 270. The name is written in the MSS. here as مليك and باده is printed in the lith. ed. as بدن. I have retained the name previously given to him. According to Firishtah on 'Imād-ul-mulk's death, his son I'tbār-ul-mulk obtained his father's place, and became very near (to the Sultān), and having attained to the post of *vazīr* his affairs reached such a high position, that he became the person to whom the high and low all looked up. Col. Briggs, so far as I can see, omits all reference to this matter. Bayley quotes the *Ṭabakāt*. The Cambridge History of India, page 309, agrees partially with *Ṭabaqāt*, and partially with Firishtah. According to it, on the death of 'Imād-ul-Mulk, he "was succeeded by his son Buda 'Imād-ul-Mulk".

<sup>2</sup> This is the year in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. According to Firishtah it was 887 A.H., and according to Col. Briggs 887 A.H., 1482 A.D. Bayley gives the same year; while the Cambridge History of India briefly refers to a failure of rains and famine.

<sup>3</sup> He is called "Malik Sidā Khāssiah Khēl Sultānī who was posted at Mor Imli otherwise called Rasūlābād", in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 207; and Bayley says in a note that he is called Malik Sadhā in the *Ṭabakāt-i-Akbarī*. The Cambridge History of India, page 309, calls him Malik Sūdha, governor of Rasūlābād; which is said there to be 14 miles S.E. of Chāmpānēr. Firishtah apparently does not mention him, though he says that the Rājputs of Chāmpānēr harried the Musalmāns of Rasūlābād.



Saiyid <sup>1</sup> Badī Alangdār for guarding the road and for the bringing in of provisions. It so happened, that one day when the Saiyid was escorting a convoy of provisions, the Rājput̃s fell on them from an ambush; and they slew a body of the troops, and carried away all the provisions. The Sultān, on hearing this news, became very depressed and sad; and he sat down at the foot of the fort of Chāmpānīr, till the end of Šafar of that year; and did everything to carry on the siege with great vigour. Muḥāfiẓ Khān mounted every morning, and inspected all the batteries till midday, and then returning made report of the state of things to the Sultān. When the siege had progressed in a satisfactory and perfect manner, he ordered that covered ways should be laid down from (all) four directions. They say that for every plank that they carried to the top of the hill, the wages of the men carrying it amounted to one lakh *tankas*. Rāy Batāi, seeing this state of things, and owing to great weakness and exhaustion, again sent ambassadors and submitted, that he would send a tribute of nine *mans* of gold and of grain which would suffice for feeding the army for two years. The Sultān said "It is impossible that <sup>2</sup> I should rise from the place, till this fort should have been conquered".

When the ambassadors returned despondent, Rāy Batāi in the year 888 A.H. sent his experienced *vakīl* <sup>3</sup> Sūrā to Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn Khaljī, and asked for help; and undertook to pay one *lakh* of *tankas* for every stage in the march of his army, as a contribution to his expenses. Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn mustered his troops, and advanced to and encamped in the town of <sup>4</sup> Na'icha. When this news reached the Sultān, he left his *amīrs* at the different stations, and marched himself

<sup>1</sup> The name of this man appears to be سید بدی النگدار in the MSS. It is سیدی لنگی درار in the lith. ed. He is called سید بدر, Saiyid Badr in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and Syud Mudun Lung by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 67).

<sup>2</sup> Both MSS. have ازین سر زمین برخاستن ممکن نیست; but the lith. ed. has ازین سر زمین ممکن نیست که برخیزم.

<sup>3</sup> He is called سورا in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has سور; Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 67) has Shew Ray; and the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 208) has Sahūrā; and the Cambridge History of India (p. 309) Sūrī.

<sup>4</sup> The name is written نعلیچہ in both MSS. In the lith. ed. it is لعلچہ Lalja. Firishtah, lith. ed., has نعلیچہ Nalja. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley) Na'ichah.



as far as the town of <sup>1</sup> Dahūd to meet him. At this place the news reached him, that <sup>2</sup> Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn had sent for the learned men one day, and asked for an expression of their opinion on the following point : “ a *bādshāh* of the Musalmāns has besieged a hill of the infidels, is it right according to the *Sharaʿ* that I should reinforce and go to help the latter ”. The learned men said, “ it is not right ”. Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn immediately went back to Mandū. The Sultān on hearing this tune (of joyfulness) was delighted; came back to Chāmpānīr; and laid the foundation of a <sup>3</sup> *Jāmaʿ* mosque.

The *amīrs* and the *sardārs* now knew for certain, that the Sultān would not leave the place until the fort should be conquered, and made a very great effort in planning the conquest. When the construction of the covered ways was completed, the soldiers in the Sultān's own battery saw one day from the covered way, that most of the Rājput̃s went away in the morning for cleaning their teeth and for their ablutions, and only a few remained on the bastions. When they reported this to the Sultān he ordered that Qawām-ul-mulk on the following <sup>4</sup> day in the year 889 A.H., at the true dawn should

<sup>1</sup> The name of the town should be transliterated as Dahūd. Firishtah, lith. ed., has دهر, apparently a mistake; Col. Briggs has D'har; Bayley (p. 208) has Dahōd; and the Cambridge History of India (p. 309) Dohad.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah agrees with this; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 68) says that the Sooltan “on being reproached by his nobles and officers, for entertaining an intention of marching to the assistance of an infidel” disbanded his army, and returned to Mando.

<sup>3</sup> The Cambridge History of India, p. 309, says that the mosque, which still adorns the ruins of the city, was built before Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn's offer to aid the Raja. This does not agree with the other histories, according to which the foundations of the mosque were laid after the Sultān's return from Dahūd. The author of the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* laments the ruin which had overwhelmed Chāmpānīr during his time. He says (Bayley, p. 212) “Now thanks be to God, Chāmpānīr is not still the same. The buildings are in ruins, it is inhabited by the tiger, and the gardens are for the most part jungle, nor is there any sandal wood produced : its very name is unknown ”. The first sentence is curious. There is, however, no mention of the mosque.

<sup>4</sup> No date is given in either the MSS. or the lith. ed. Only the year is mentioned at this place, but it appears a few sentences further on, that the date was the first of Dhī-qa'dah. Firishtah in the corresponding passage gives neither date nor year. Bayley after giving the account of the capture of Chāmpānīr, says

take the Sultān's own troops with him, and should advance his *sābāṭ* (covered way) into the fort. There was every hope that the flag of victory should be unfurled from the flag-staff of hope. On the following morning which was the 1st of Dhī-qa'dah, Malik Qawām-ul-mulk with the Sultān's own troops hurled himself from the covered way into the fort and slew a large number of the garrison, and a great fight took place. They drove the Rājput̃s to the gate of the citadel. Rāy Batāī and other Rājput̃s then prepared for *jauhar* and Qawām-ul-mulk and the other leaders having the great good fortune of martyrdom before the eyes of their noble spirit lavished all efforts and made every endeavour.

It so happened that a few days before this, they had shot a cannon ball on the rampart of the fort from the western side; and several cracks and fissures had appeared in the rampart of the great citadel. Malik Āyāz Sultānī availing himself of an opportunity went to the crack in the rampart; with a body of soldiers from that crack, which was in truth, the crack by which the angel of the death of the garrison made his entrance, they rushed into the great citadel and by way of the <sup>1</sup> *bārah* ascended to the top of the great gate. At this time Sultān Maḥmūd came to the top of the *sābāṭ* and placing his face of humility in the dust offered prayers, and, as victory and triumph still delayed, he sent reinforcements. The Rājput̃s being harassed and discomfited threw bombs filled with gun-powder on the roof of the gate. It so happened, however, that from the seat of divine mercy the breeze of success and victory blew, (the men on the top of the gate) seized those very bombs and threw them into the courtyard of the palace of Rāy Batāī. When the Rājput̃s found that things had come to this condition, at every place where they had arranged a *jauhar*

---

that the Tabakāt and Firishtah give a fuller account of how it was seized; and proceeds to quote from them. It would appear from his account, page 210, that the attack of Kiwām-ul-Mulk was made on the 1st Zī-l-ka'dah, 889 A.H. The Cambridge History of India does not specially mention this particular incident.

<sup>1</sup> The word is *بارو*, *bārū* in both MSS., but it is *بار*, *bārah* in the lith. ed., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I have retained *bārah*, as it occurs in *Imām-barah*, etc. The translation in Bayley gives no help. It says: from that breach "they fought their way to the roof of the principal gate". M. Hidayat Ḥosain has *bārah* in the text-edition.

they set fire to them, and burnt all their dependents and children. The whole of that day and night and the next day the entire (Musalmān) army remained under arms and fought. On the second day which was the 2nd of Dhī-qa'dah, 889 A.H., they forced open the door and got into (the citadel) and slew a large number. Sultān Muḥammad also advanced as far as the door. A body of the Rājput̃s then threw down their arms and assembled round a reservoir. They all got into the water and washed their bodies, and coming out of the water seized their swords, and stood up. As the body of the Sultān's troops went near the reservoir, seven hundred Rājput̃s at once rushed on them and very large number on both sides were slain, but Rāy Batāi and Dūngarsī and a number of others were captured and brought (before the Sultān).

The Sultān performed the ceremony of offering thanks to God and made over Rāy Batāi and Dūngarsī to Muḥāsif K̃hān, so that he might have their wounds medically attended to. The same day the Sultān gave the name of Muḥammadūbād to Chāmpānīr, and made an entry into it. A number of the Rājput̃s fled, and entered the third citadel. They were brought down the same day in distress and wretchedness. When Muḥāsif K̃hān reported that Rāy Batāi's wounds had healed, the Sultān urged <sup>1</sup> him to accept Islām. He did not agree. After he had been in prison for <sup>2</sup> five months; and as he did not still accept Islām; he and <sup>3</sup> Dūngarsī were, by order of the learned men, executed. This occurred in the year 890 A.H. In the same year he passed orders for the erection of a special citadel of citadels, *Jahān Panāh*, and of palaces and gardens; and placed the work in the charge of Muḥāsif K̃hān. In the year 892 A.H., he bestowed the country

<sup>1</sup> Both Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India (p. 310) say that Rāy Batāi and Dūngarsī were both invited to accept Islām; and both refused.

<sup>2</sup> According to Firishtah he was in chains during the whole of the five months; and was every day threatened with death.

<sup>3</sup> The Cambridge History of India (p. 310) says, that the minister Sūrī was executed at the same time; but this does not appear to be mentioned in the *Ṭabaqāt* or in Firishtah; and the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* (Bayley, p. 211) says, that the Sultān ordered the execution of the Rāy, and of his minister: but whether this refers to Dūngarsī or to Sūrī is not clear.

of Sōrath and the forts of Jūnāgarh and Karnāl on Shāhzāda <sup>1</sup> Khālīl Khān.

In the year 892 A.H. (the Christian year is given as 1486 A.D.), some merchants coming from Dehlī arrived in <sup>2</sup> Muḥammadābād and complained that they were bringing <sup>3</sup> four hundred and three horses.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah calls him the Sultān's پسر کوچک or younger son, but he is not mentioned by Col. Briggs. In the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* he is mentioned on page 216; and it is said in a note that he afterwards became Muzaḥfar II. It appears from the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, page 239, that he was the Sultān's fourth son by Rānī Harbāi, daughter of the Tāh Rānah, a Rājput *zamīndar* on the bank of Mahindri. The Rānī died the fourth or fifth day after the prince's birth. It is said that immediately after his birth the prince was taken by the Sultān to Hāus Bāi (the swan-like lady, as Bayley takes the trouble to explain that her name signifies), the widow of Sultān Muḥamad, and Sultān Mahmūd's step-mother. She educated the prince with more than a mother's care; and Sultān Muḥamad (*sic*) used to say, whenever he saw him, "The line of my kingly ancestors will be carried on by this boy and his descendants".

It is curious that at least three of Sultān Mahmūd's four sons were born of Hindū mothers, viz. (1) Muḥammad Kūlā, whose mother was Rānī Rūp Manjarī, who had previously been married to Sultān Kntb-ud-dīn, and after his death came to Sultān Mahmūd. The prince and his mother both predeceased the Sultān; (2) Abū Khān, whose mother was Rānī Pirāi. He was poisoned by his father's order because he had gone to some one's house who found him there and thrashed him; (3) Ahmad Khān, who was nick-named Khudāwand Khān's Ahmad Shāh, as Khudāwand Khān had conspired to place him on the throne, as had already been mentioned. His mother's name is not mentioned. The fourth son was Khālīl Khān.

<sup>2</sup> There is some difference as to the place where the merchants complained to the Sultān. Both the *Ṭabaqāt* and *Firishtah* say that they came to Muḥammadābād, and made their complaint there. In the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 216, it is said, "he then went to Ahmadābād. A party of merchants came to him complaining", etc. from which one would infer that the complaint was made at Ahmadābād. The *Cambridge History of India* (p. 310) says, that the complaint was made when he was "hunting at Hālol near Chāmpāner".

<sup>3</sup> He is called راي قلعہ آبرو, in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*, and the number of horses is said to be four hundred there. Col. Briggs says that the name and the country of the chief is omitted in the original, and he does not give the number of the horses. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* says that the merchants complained that "they were bringing four hundred Persian and Turki horses from 'Irāk and Khurāsān, and some rolls of Hindustānī fabrics". But on reaching the foot of mount Abū, the Rājah of Sirōhī had seized them all (Bayley, pp. 216, 217). The

The Rāja of the hill of Ābū had taken them all by force and had looted the whole caravan. (The Sultān) on hearing their words immediately ordered that the price of the horses might be paid to the merchants from the treasury, and having conferred robes of honour on them, commenced to muster his troops and after some days advanced to devastate that country. He sent a *farmān* addressed to the Rāja of Ābū, by the hands of the merchants, in advance of himself. The purport of the *farmān* was this that as the merchants were bringing the horses and other merchandise for the Sultān, and he (the Rāja) had taken them with violence, he should at once give back to the merchants exactly what he had taken from them; otherwise he should be prepared to meet the anger and wrath of the Sultān. When the merchants took the *farmān* the Rāja of Ābū, in great alarm, made over to them three hundred and seventy horses, which he had in their original condition, and gave them the price of thirty-three horses, which had become disabled; and also sent a heavy tribute (to the Sultān) by their hand. <sup>1</sup> The merchants came and waited on the Sultān, informed him of the true state of things, and also placed the tribute of the Rāja before him, upon which he turned back and came to Muḥammadābād Chāmpānir.

In the year <sup>2</sup> 896 A.H. (1491 A.D.) news came that Bahādur Gīlānī, servant (گهراست) of Khwājah Maḥmūd Gīlānī, had turned his head from the obedience due to his master Sultān Maḥmūd <sup>3</sup> Lashkarī,

Cambridge History of India (p. 310) makes the number of horses four hundred and three and the name of the chief who had seized them, the Rāja of Ābū.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah says that the Rāja sent an ambassador with the merchants; and placed himself in the band of the Sultān's servants. The Cambridge History of India (p. 310) says that the Sultān "permitted the merchants to retain the horses, as well as their price". I have not seen this anywhere else; and it does not appear reasonable, that the merchants who had come from great distance to sell the horses, should have them returned to them.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. gives 900 A.H., and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 71) gives 900 A.H., 1494 A.D. as the year.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. have محمود but the lith. ed. has لشکری. Sultān Muḥammad Lashkarī had, however, died some time before this; and his son Sultān Maḥmūd was the nominal ruler, though much of the power was in the hands of Qāsim Barid. It appears from other histories that Sultān Maḥmūd was in command of the troops that were sent against Bahādur Gīlānī. I have therefore substituted Sultān Maḥmūd for Sultān Muḥammad Lashkarī.

the ruler of the Deccan; and having taken unlawful and forcible possession of the part of Dābul, was causing harassment to ships passing over the sea; and the passage of coming to and going from Gujrāt had become closed and he had also forcibly carried away the Sultān's own ships. Immediately, on hearing this news, the Sultān mustered his troops and sent an army under Malik Qawām-ul-mulk by land route, and he also despatched many ships. When this news reached Sultān Mahmūd Bahmanī, he summoned the *amīrs* and said, "On several occasions help has come to us from his ancestors; and the greatness and grandeur of Sultān Mahmūd is known to all; and the consideration of the rights of this great dynasty is obligatory and incumbent on our spirit and energy. It is, therefore, right and proper that we should turn our attention to his (Bahādur Gilānī's) destruction". The *amīrs* and *vazīrs* applauded the opinion and acknowledged the truth of the statement and began to collect troops. (At the same time) a letter couched in terms of sincerity was sent to Sultān Mahmūd; and preparations were made for the punishment of Bahādur Gilānī, and of teaching him a lesson. At the moment which the astrologers declared to be auspicious to Sultān Mahmūd, he marched from the city of Bidar to effect the destruction of Bahādur; and after fighting slew him. The particulars of this occurrence have been narrated in the section about the Deccan.

In the year 897 A.H. (1474 A.D.), Sultān Mahmūd marched towards the Mahrāsa; and on the day, spies reported to him that Alf Khān, son of Ulugh Khān, had fled as he had spent stipends (due to his retainers) for his own purposes, and was afraid that they might apply to the Sultān for redress, and indignities might be inflicted on him. The Sultān sent Sharf-i-Juhān to reassure him, and although

---

<sup>1</sup> Firishah and Col. Briggs say that Alf Khān revolted in 904 A.H., 1498 A.D.; and their account is briefer than, and somewhat different from that in the *Talukāt*. In the *Mahrā-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 220, the Sultān is said to have marched to Morāsh on account of Alaf Khān's rebellion. In a note Bayley gives the version in the *Talukāt*. The account given in the *Cambridge History of India*, page 311, differs from the others. The year of the revolt is said there to be 1492; and the name of the rebel is Bahā-ud-dīn Ulugh Khān, son of Ulugh Khān Sahrāb. He is said to have fled because the people rose against him, on account of his oppressing them, and of appropriating the pay of the troops.

action many Firangīs and four hundred Turks were slain. The Firangīs fled; and <sup>4</sup> one of their large ships, the cargo in which was valued at one *krōr*, having had its mast struck and broken off by a cannon ball was sunk. Sultān Maḥmūd after carrying out the rites of offering thanks to God, returned to Muḥammadābād Chāmpānīr.

In the year 914 A.H. <sup>5</sup> Ādil Khān, son of Ḥasan Khān, made a representation to Sultān Maḥmūd, through his mother, who was the

<sup>1</sup> Frishtah's account is somewhat different. He says that the *Firangīs* wanted to build forts on the coast. The Sultān of Rūm, who was their enemy had, on hearing this, sent many ships to carry on a war of religion, and to prevent their carrying out their objects. Some of these ships had arrived in the Gujrāt ports. Sultān Maḥmūd also intending to carry on religious war there, started towards the ports of Diśi and Daman and Mahūm; and when he arrived at Daman he sent his special slave Āyūz Sultānī, who was the Amīr-ul-umrū and Satarsūl from the port of Dip. Col. Briggs's account (vol. IV, p. 74) is similar but he says that the Turkish fleet was under "Ameer Hoossein" whom the Portuguese called Meer Hashim. The account given in the Cambridge History of India, page 312, is long and comprehensive, but it is unnecessary to refer to it here in detail.

<sup>2</sup> See note I, page 246.

<sup>3</sup> The name is written in Persian as جیرل, but is written in English as Choulor or Chaul.

<sup>4</sup> This was their flag-ship, and probably had on board Don Laurence, the son of Vasco da Gama, who was killed.





descendant of the rulers of Asir and Burhānpūr on the throne of that kingdom; and Malik Lādan Khalji, who was in possession of (the other) half of the country of Asir had taken up an attitude hostile to Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn Maghūl, and had taken up a fortified position on the hill of Asir. Sultān Maḥmūd, on hearing of these happenings, advanced to <sup>1</sup>Thālnīr. Malik ‘Ālam Shah, the *thānadār* of Thālnīr, came and waited upon him, through the intervention of ‘Azīz-ul-mulk Sultānī, *thānadār* of Sultānpūr; and evacuating his *thāna*, <sup>2</sup>surrendered it to the Sultān.

On hearing this news, Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri left four thousand horsemen with ‘Ālam Khān and Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn and himself went to Kāwīl. As Sultān Maḥmūd felt slightly indisposed in Thālnīr, he remained there for some time; and sent Aṣaf Khān, and Malik ‘Aziz-ul-mulk, with a well-equipped army to punish Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn and ‘Ālam Khān. When these officers advanced towards Burhānpūr, the troops left behind by Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri turned their faces to their own country, without (obtaining) the permission of Ḥisām-ud-dīn. Malik Lādan Khalji came forward to welcome Aṣaf Khān, and had an interview with him. Aṣaf Khān took him with himself to wait upon the Sultān. Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn also, ashamed and repentant, came and joined the Sultān’s camp; and both were honoured with kindness and favour. After the ‘*Īd-ud-ḍuḥa*, at an auspicious moment, the Sultān conferred the title of A’zam Humāyūn on ‘Ādil Khān, and bestowed on him four elephants and <sup>3</sup>thirty *lakhs* of *tankas* as a contribution towards his expenses; and entrusted to him the reins of the government and defence of Asir and Burhānpūr. He conferred the title of Khān Jahān on Malik Lādan, and gave him permission to go back with A’zam Humāyūn ‘Ādil Khān. As

---

Ghaznī Khān, who was poisoned after a reign of ten days. Ahmad Nizām Shāh now invaded Khāndesh with the object of placing another scion of the Fērūqī house, also named ‘Ālam Khān, who had taken refuge in his court.

<sup>1</sup> تہانیر in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> This incident does not appear to be mentioned anywhere else.

<sup>3</sup> It is لک سی thirty *lakhs* in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. Firishtah, however, on page 204 of the lith. ed. (vol. II) has سه three *lakhs*. Col. Briggs has not mentioned the various gifts. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 225, has thirteen *lakhs*. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the gifts.

Malik Lādan had been born in the village of <sup>1</sup> Banās, that *mouḍah* was granted to him as a reward. The Sultān also conferred the title of Ghāzi Khān on <sup>2</sup> Malik Muḥammad Bākhā, son of 'Imād-ul-mulk Asīrī, and that of Qutb Khān on Malik 'Ālam Shāh *thānadār* of Thālnir, that of Muḥāfiẓ Khān on Malik Ḥāfiẓ, and that of Saif Khān on his brother Malik Yūsuf, and sent them back in attendance on A'zam Humāyūn. <sup>3</sup> He left Malik Naṣrat-ul-mulk and Mujaḥhid-ul-mulk Gujrātī in the service of A'zam Humāyūn, after giving them money to defray their expenses. On the 17th Dhī-ḥijjah, he marched from that station and proceeded towards Sultānpūr Nadarbār. At the first station (in the march), he conferred the title of Shahryār on Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn Maḡhūl, and having bestowed the *mouḍah* of <sup>4</sup> Dhanūra, which is one of the dependencies of Sultānpūr, and two elephants, gave him permission to go back. He himself then by successive marches arrived at Muḥammadābād Chāmpānir on the 16th of the sacred month of Muḥarram in the year 916 A.H. (1510 A.D.).

'Ādil Khān, after his arrival at Burhānpūr, (found that) <sup>5</sup> Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn Shahryār, Malik Bākhā and Ghāzi Khān had, on account

<sup>1</sup> The name is بناس in the MSS., and in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 76) makes it the district of Ahwas. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 225, has "The village of Banās in the paraganā Sultānpūr". In the text-edition بناس is apparently a typographical error.

<sup>2</sup> The name is as I have it in the text in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; but Firishtah lith. ed. has ملک نالہا and Malik Nālḥā, son of 'Imad-ul-mulk Khān-dēshī; and the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 225, has Muḥammad Mākhā.

<sup>3</sup> The sentence from حسام الدین to گزاشت و ملک حسام الدین, is not to be found in one MS., but is in the other and in the lith. ed.

<sup>4</sup> The name is رهنوره in the MSS. and in the lith. ed.; and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. It is Dhanūrah also in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 225; but Col. Briggs has (vol. IV, p. 76) "the town of Dhoor".

<sup>5</sup> There are variations in the readings. The MSS. have the reading which I have adopted. The reading in the lith. ed. is different. The other histories do not give the details of the way in which Ḥisām-ud-dīn was murdered. Firishtah merely says سلطان اعظم همايون ملک حسام الدین شهریار را کشته اعوان اورا قتل عام نمود. And the Cambridge History of India, page 314, says "one of his ('Ādil Khān III's) first acts was to cause Malik Husain, who was again plotting with the king of Ahmadnagar, to be assassinated".

of an ill-feeling which they had with Malik Lādan Khuljī Khān Jahān, left Burhānpūr; and had taken up their residence in Thāhūr. After some days, news was brought to Aẓam Humāyūn, that Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn Shahryār had combined with Niẓām-ul-mulk Bahri, and wanted to raise the dust of disturbance. Having become cognisant of this treachery on his part, Aẓam Humāyūn sent a message to summon him. Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn knowing the state of things came towards Burhānpūr with four thousand horsemen. When he arrived in the vicinity of the city, Aẓam Humāyūn went forward to receive him with <sup>1</sup> three thousand Gujrātī horsemen, took him to his palace, and after conferring on him a robe of honour, gave him permission to go back to his camp. On the following day he arranged with the men in his confidence, that when Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn would come to the hall of audience, he should be taken by the hand to the private chamber; and when he would be bidding farewell, Daryā Shāh Gujrātī, who would be carrying the sword of Aẓam Humāyūn 'Ādil Khān, should deal him a fatal wound. After he is murdered, his men should also be murdered at the various places (where they happen to be). According to this agreement, a man was sent to summon Ḥisām-ud-dīn. The latter, in his great pride and conceit, came with all his followers. After they had met, (Aẓam Humāyūn) in the way of consulting him took him by the hand into the private chamber. They had a short conversation, after which Aẓam Humāyūn handed him *pān* (betel), and bade him farewell. At this time Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn straightened himself up, and <sup>2</sup> Daryā Khān struck him on the head with the sword with such force, that it was cloven in two.

When Malik Burhān 'Aḡ'-ul-lah, who was the *vazīr* of Aẓam Humāyūn, became aware of what had happened, he ordered a number of Gujrātīs, who were with him, to smite the wretches. When those men drew their swords from the scabbards, Malik Muḥammad Bākhā

<sup>1</sup> The number is سیصد thirty hundred or three thousand in both MSS.; it is سیصد هزار thirty hundred thousand, which is of course incorrect, in the 1th. ed.; Firishtah has سی صد three hundred, which is more probable; and in the Persian text of Muntakhah-al-Jahān, vol. III, page 443, has سی صد و دو two hundred three hundred.

<sup>2</sup> The same man is called Daryā Shāh a few lines earlier.

and the other *sardārs*, who had accompanied Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn turned their faces in flight. Four hundred Ḥabshīs, who were present at the *darbār*, cut them all down, and Malik Muḥammad Bākhā and the other leaders were thrown wallowing in the dust and blood. The half of the country, which was in his possession, came without further dispute into Aʿẓam Humāyūn's possession. When the account of these events in great detail and clearness reached Sultān Maḥmūd in the month of Rabīʿ-ul-āwwal of the afore-mentioned year, <sup>1</sup> he declared that whoever did not regard the rights of the salt, fell in the end into the place of destruction.

<sup>2</sup> In the year 916 A.H., 1510 A.D., a petition from Aʿẓam Humāyūn reached (Sultān Maḥmūd), to the effect, that he had, on one occasion, gone to the fort of Asir; and that he had found Shēr Khān and Saif Khān who were in charge of it, full of mischief and hostility; and now that Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn had been slain, these two wretches had combined together in their enmity and malice; and they had written a letter to Nizām-ul-mulk Baḥrī, and had summoned Khānzāda ʿĀlam Khān. This slave (*i.e.*, he himself) in concert with Malik Lādan Khān Jahān and Mujāhid-ul-mulk and other *amīrs* had advanced to the fort, and is besieging it. Nizām-ul-mulk Baḥrī has brought ʿĀlam Khān with him, and has come with his army, and is stationed near the border. It is true, if he should enter this slave's territory, he would have to raise the siege, and would have to go and fight with him. The Sultān bestowed five *lakhs* of *tankas*

---

<sup>1</sup> This is also mentioned by Firishtah.

<sup>2</sup> This also is mentioned by Firishtah; but he says that Nizām-ul-mulk had come to his border bringing with him ʿĀlam Khān, and with the Rāja of Kālwa. It may be mentioned also that he says that the five *lakhs* of *tankas* were تنگہ سفید or silver *tankas*. Col. Briggs after mentioning Mahmood Shah's return to Sooltanpoor says (vol. IV, p. 76) "Notwithstanding these arrangements, internal commotions occurred at Aseer during the following year, which were amicably adjusted through the agency of Mahmood Shah, who sent his own son to carry into effect his orders, and to confirm the authority of Adil Khan". This is scarcely correct. The adjustment was anything but amicable, so far as Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn and Malik Muḥammad Bākhā, etc., who accompanied Malik Ḥisām-ud-dīn, were concerned; and not even so far as Shēr Khān and Saif Khān and Khānzāda ʿĀlam Khān were concerned. It does not also appear that any son of Sultān Maḥmūd was sent to Khāndēsh to settle matters there.

as a contribution to his expenses, and sent Dilāwar Khān, Ṣafdar Khān and other *amīrs* to help and reinforce him. He also wrote in reply, "let my (grand)son's mind remain assured, that whenever there should be any necessity, I shall myself go to his aid. How can Nizām-ul-mulk Bahṛī, who is a slave of one of the Sultāns of the Deccan, have such power that he should cause any damage to the territory of my (grand)son". The *amīrs* mentioned above had not yet marched from outside the city, when <sup>1</sup> Shāhzāda Muẓaffar Khān, an account of whom will before long be narrated, came from the town of Barōda, and having obtained the honour of kissing his father's feet prayed for and obtained a further sum of seven *lakhs* of *tankas* towards A'ẓam Humāyūn's expenses.

After some days, an emissary of Nizām-ul-mulk Bahṛī came and waited on the Sultān and presented a petition (of his master) to the following effect. "As 'Ālam Khānzāda came as a suppliant to me; I hope that he (the Sultān) will be pleased to bestow a part of the

---

<sup>1</sup> It appears from the Cambridge History of India, page 314, that A'ẓam Humāyūfi or 'Ādil Khān III cemented his alliance with Gujārāt by marrying a daughter of Sultān Muẓaffar. I have not seen this mentioned anywhere else, except in the Muntakhab-al-labāb, vol. III, page 445; but it is stated there that Sultān Maḥmūd gave a daughter of Sultān Muẓaffar in marriage to him at the same time that he conferred the title of A'ẓam Humāyūn on him, and confirmed him in the government of Khāndēsh. So that it was more the act of Sultān Maḥmūd than of A'ẓam Humāyūn. Besides it was scarcely necessary for A'ẓam Humāyūn to cement his alliance with Gujṛāt by marriage. He was the grandson (daughter's son) of Sultān Maḥmūd; and was being treated with great affection and kindness by the Sultān himself, and by his son Shāhzāda Muẓaffar, (who is somewhat loosely and incorrectly called Sultān Muẓaffar, while his father was still alive, both in the Cambridge History of India and in the Muntakhab-al-labāb). It appears from Firishtah that the Shāhzāda prayed for the additional grant, not for his son-in-law, but for his nephew (*khwāhar-zāda*), so that the earlier relation had greater force and validity with Sultān Maḥmūd and Shāhzāda Muẓaffar than the later one. The Muntakhab-al-labāb, vol. III, page 444, has a somewhat different account. It says Sultān Maḥmūd, immediately on becoming acquainted with the purport of the letter, sent twelve *lakhs* of Maḥmūdīs, which amount to six lakhs of rupees current at that time, and various articles, such as vessels of gold and silver, etc. The twelve *lakhs* may include the five *lakhs* originally given, and the seven *lakhs* given at the request of Shāhzāda Muẓaffar. He also made an assignment of eight *lakhs* of *tankas* out of the revenues (*maḥsūl*) of *pargana* Sultānpūr.

country of Asir and Burhānpūr on him." The Sultān sent for the emissary, and told him, "Since <sup>1</sup> he (*i.e.*, Nizām-ul-mulk) places his foot further than his blanket, he will soon receive his merited punishment". In short, when the *amirs* mentioned above (Dilāwar Khān, etc.) arrived at the town of Nalārbar, Shēr Khān and Saif Khān, being now aware of the disastrous end of their affairs, carried their application to Malik Majāhid-ul-mulk, and prayed for protection. A'zam Humāyūn, finding this to be an undesired boon, gave them promise and engagement. Shēr Khān and Saif Khān, relying on his promise, came out of the fort, and went away to the territory of Kāwil. After the arrival of Dilāwar Khān and the other *amirs*, <sup>2</sup> 'Ādil Khān determined on raiding the country of Kālha. After he had harried a few of the villages and hamlets, the Rāja of Kālha sent tribute, and prayed for forgiveness <sup>3</sup> of his offences. 'Ādil Khān then gave the Gujrāt *amirs* leave to go back to their country, and returned to Burhānpūr.

It was in this year that Sultān Sikandar Lādi, the Bādshāh of Dehli sent, as a matter of special friendship, some nice things as presents to the Sultān. Before this no Bādshāh of Dehli had sent any presents to any Bādshāh of Gujrāt. It was also in Dhī-hijjah of the year 916 A.H. (1510 A.D.) that Sultān Mahmūd travelled towards Nahrwāla, and made the learned and pious men and the *faqirs*, living there, happy by granting largesses and favours to them. He told (them), that the object of his coming there was this, that he should <sup>4</sup> bid adieu to the sainted ones there; perhaps the angel of death would not give him further respite. The learned and great men all offered prayers for him, each in his particular way. He then

<sup>1</sup> The word او is omitted from the MSS. According to Firishtah, the Sultān's words to the emissary were a good deal sterner and more emphatic.

<sup>2</sup> 'Ādil Khān, whom Nizām-ul-dīn has been calling A'zam Humāyūn, is here again called by his proper name.

<sup>3</sup> A sentence, which occurs in the lith. ed. at this place, but is omitted from both MSS. is عالم خان از ان سرزمین برخاست; and means, and 'Ālam Khān left that country. I have omitted it from the text, but in the text-edition

امرای گجرات and عادل خان ازین سرزمین is retained between

<sup>4</sup> One MS. inserts کرد بچلی after رخصت which appears to be illegible and unintelligible.

mounted and proceeded to circumambulate the tombs of the Shaikh̲s of Pattan, may the mercy of God be on them all ! On the 4th day, he started on the journey to Aḥmadābād : and having circumambulated the holy tomb of <sup>1</sup> Shaikh̲ Aḥmad Khattū, may his soul be sanctified ! turned towards Muḥammadābād. As at this time he felt very ill and weak, he summoned Shāhzāda Muẓaffar Khān from the town of Barōda, and gave him pleasant advice. After four days, when he saw some signs of improvements in his health, he granted leave to the Shāhzāda to return to Barōda. But after a few days the illness increased and he became extremely infirm and weak.

At this time, one day, Farḥat-ul-mulk reported to him, that Shāh Ismā'īl, the Bādshāh of Irān, had sent Yādgar Bēg Qazlbāsh, with a body of other Qazlbāshes with elegant presents, in the way of an embassy. He said <sup>2</sup> "May the great God not show me the face of a Qazlbāsh, who is (a follower of) the enemies of the <sup>3</sup> companions of the Prophet of God, may the benediction of God and salutation be on him ! and of the perpetrators of oppression ; and as a matter of

<sup>1</sup> This was at Sarkhēj. Firishtah also says that it was the tomb of Shaikh̲ Aḥmad Khattū, that he visited here ; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 77) makes it the tomb of "Sheikh Ahmad Gersoo-Duraz".

<sup>2</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 315, says that "Yādgar Bēg Qazlbāsh was commissioned to invite Mahmūd to embrace the Shiāh faith". This may be correct, but I have not seen it stated in any work of a Muhammadan historian. Elphinstone on page 765 of his History of India (edition 1889) says "the reign of Mozaffar opened with a splendid embassy from Shāh Ismā'īl king of Persia". This is not strictly correct : the embassy had been sent to Sultān Mahmūd, but it only arrived after his death, and the accession of Sultān Muẓaffar. Elphinstone concludes the paragraph by saying that the embassy "was probably designed to conciliate their favour to the Shiā religion". If this is the foundation of the statement in the Cambridge History of India, it scarcely justifies the positive assertion that is made there. It also adds somewhat picturesquely that Mahmūd sent a message to "the heretics bidding them begone". This is also not mentioned anywhere as far as I have seen. On the other hand, it is said both in the Ṭabaqāt and by Firishtah that he expressed a pious wish, that God might not show him the face of a Qazlbāsh : and this actually happened for he died before Yādgar Bēg could reach Muḥammadābād. It would, in fact, appear that he could not be approaching Muḥammadābād, if the Sultān had bade him begone.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah says more precisely اصحاب ائمة or the three companions, namely Abū Bakr and 'Umr and 'Uthmān.





AN ACCOUNT OF <sup>1</sup>SULTĀN MUẒAFFAR SHĀH, SON OF MAHMŪD SHĀH.

As on Monday, the 2nd of Ramaḍān in the year 917 A.H., Maḥmūd Shāh son of Muḥammad Shāh passed away from the narrowness of bodily existence to the wide spaces of the spiritual world, Shāhzāda MuẒaffar Khān arrived after two hours (*sā'at*) of the night of Tuesday the 3rd of Ramaḍān (had passed); and by the exertions of the *amīrs* and the men learned in divine knowledge, sat on the throne of sovereignty. The people performed the ceremony of the offering of service and of wave offerings. On the same night, he sent the body of his father to the tomb,—which is the resting place of light, of the chief of Shaikhs, Shaikh Aḥmad Khattū, may his soul be sanctified! He made over two *lakhs* of *tankas* to 'Azīz-ul-mulk so that he might distribute it, among deserving people in the town of <sup>2</sup>Sarkēj. He bestowed robes of honour on the *amīrs*, and the great men of the kingdom; and honoured some of them with suitable titles. On the same day, *khutba* was read in his name on the pulpits of Islām. Among his *khāṣa khail* (men of his own household), he conferred the title of

---

Cambridge History of India had either made a mistake or had exaggerated what he had found in some Persian history: but I find that he has if anything greatly diminished the quantity of Sultān Maḥmūd's food. According to the author of "The coins of the Gujrat Saltanat" published in the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. XXI, page 290, his daily allowance was one Gujrātī *man* in weight, i.e., forty-one pounds. His little breakfast consisted of 150 plantains, a cup of honey and another of butter; but it is not stated whether this was included in the one Gujrātī *man*, or was in addition to it. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 162, also gives him a similar quantity.

I find that the fact of his having made himself immune from the effect of poisons is based on the account of two European travellers, Bartema, as Elphinstone calls him (or more correctly Di Verthema) and Barbosa, mentioned by Elphinstone on page 764 of his History of India, 7th edition. I should be inclined to doubt the statement about the quantity of food. It is curious that the European travellers say nothing about it, and the Indian historians are equally silent about his being able to absorb abnormal quantities of poisons. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Daves, the editor of the book of Barbosa for the Hakluyt Society, page 122, that probably out of the stories about the enormous quantities of food eaten by him, arose the stories about the abnormal things he ate.

<sup>1</sup> The lith. ed. has سلطان مظفر شاه before سلطان; but both MSS. omit it.

<sup>2</sup> سرکيج in the text-edition.

'Imād-ul-mulk on Malik Khush-Qadam, and of Khudāwand Khān on Malik Rashīd-ul-mulk and placed the reins of the *vazārat* in the latter's powerful hands.

In the month of Shawwāl of the afore-mentioned year, Yādgār Bēg Qazlbāsh, the ambassador of Shāh Ismā'il arrived from 'Irāq to the neighbourhood of Muḥammadābād. The Sultān sent all the *amīrs* and *vazīrs* to welcome him, and <sup>1</sup> met him on his arrival with pleasure and gratitude. Yādgār Bēg placed the beautiful presents which he had brought for Maḥmūd Shāh, at the service of Muẓaffar Shāh. The latter conferred kingly robes on Yādgār Bēg and all the Qazlbāshes and selected a special mansion for their residence.

After some days he went from Muḥammadābād to the town of Barōda, and he gave the name of Daulatābād to that town. At this time news came that <sup>2</sup> Ṣāhib Khān son of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn Khālji, who had revolted with the help of Khwājah Jahān the eunuch of Sultān Maḥmūd, and had seized Mandū and assumed the title of <sup>3</sup> Sultān Muḥammad, and had made most of the nobles take his side, as the pen has attempted to narrate these events in the section about Mālwa, now fled from Mandū, and came praying for help. Sultān Muẓaffar sent Muḥāfiẓ Khān to receive and welcome Ṣāhib Khān, so that he

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have تلقى but the other MS. has ثلاثی. It appears that the embassy from the Shāh of Persia in respect of which Sultān Maḥmūd had expressed a pious wish that he might not have to show his face to them, and whom in the forcible language of the Cambridge History of India he ordered to be begone was received with much favour by Sultān Muẓaffar. Firishtah goes a little further than Nizām-ud-dīn. He says در شرایط تعظیم و تکریم دقیقہ فرو گذاشت نشد *minutia* was omitted.

<sup>2</sup> There is some slight difference in the readings here; both MSS. read خواجہ سرا بر سلطان محمود but the lith. ed. has خواجہ سرای سلطان محمود. I have adopted the former reading. The sentence requires some explanation. Ṣāhib Khān was the elder brother of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, but the latter deposed him and became the Sultān, and took the title of Sultān Maḥmūd (II). Afterwards Ṣāhib Khān rebelled against him; and having seized Mandū assumed the title of Sultān Muḥammad. but on being defeated afterwards, came to Sultān Muẓaffar for help.

<sup>3</sup> The correct title Sultān Muḥammad is given in one MS. but the other MS. and the lith. ed. have Sultān Maḥmūd.

might carry out the rites of hospitality and try to please his heart. After an interview (Sultān Muẓaffar) remained for some days at Barōda in order to entertain Šāhib Khān; and then went away to Muḥammad-ābād. He sent Qaiṣar Khān to the town of Dahūd, that he might report a correct and detailed account of Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji, and of the condition of the country of Mālwa and of the behaviour of the amīrs. As the rains (now) commenced, the people halted at the various places where they happened to be. Šāhib Khān sent a message one day to the effect that a long time <sup>1</sup> had elapsed since the coming of the *faqīr*, but he does not see that there has been any progress in his affairs. The Sultān replied, "If the great God so wills, I shall at the end of the rains, either amicably or by force recover half the kingdom of Mālwa from the possession of Sultān Maḥmūd and shall make it over to you". But as the star of the fortune of Šāhib Khān was on the decline, it so happened, that he became friendly with Yādgar Bēg Qazlbāsh, who had become known to the people of Gujrāt by the name of *Surkh kulāh*, i.e., red cap, owing to their living near each other. <sup>2</sup> One day there was a quarrel between the servants (of the

---

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has بنده instead of فقیر in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. Contrary to what is stated in the text and in *Firishtah* about Šāhib Khān's complaint about Qaiṣar Khān having done nothing to carry out the work which he had been deputed to perform, the *Cambridge History of India*, page 316, says, that Qaiṣar Khān returned with a report favourable to Šāhib Khān's claim. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 245, gives a somewhat different account of the work which Kaisar Khān was to do, but it says nothing about his return, or his submitting any report.

<sup>2</sup> This incident is variously stated in the different histories. *Firishtah's* account is similar to that in the text; but he adds that the Qazlbāshes wounded some of Šāhib Khān's men. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 80, 81) says that the Kuzilbashes wounded several persons wholly unconnected with the affair. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, pages 245, 246, begins with the altercation between the servants, but goes on to say that there was some trouble between Šāhib Khān, who is called Shāhẓāda Muḥamad, and the Persian envoy, who is called quite incorrectly Mirza Ibrāhīm. Šāhib Khān went in the evening to some old servant of his who lived in the same *serai* as the Persian envoy. Some strife monger told the latter that Šāhib Khān wanted to rob him; and he shut the door of the *serai*, and afterwards took Šāhib Khān to his own apartment. In the morning Šāhib Khān escaped, and spread a report, that an order had been issued to plunder the Kuzilbashes. A great crowd collected and a fight took place. Many

two households); and it ended in a fight, and the house of Yādgār Bēg was looted. A report spread among the Gujrāt soldiers, that the Turkīmāns had seized Šāhib Khān. The latter being ashamed at such a report, left without taking leave of Sultān Muẓaffar. The details of this brief statement have been mentioned in the section about Mālwa.

As, after the departure of Šāhib Khān, news came to Sultān Muẓaffar about the power and violence of the <sup>1</sup> Rājputs and of the weakness of Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji, his high spirit induced him to undertake the punishment of the former. In order to carry out this resolution, he went to Aḥmadābād, so that he might be sure of the safety of the *thānas* of his own dominions; and he might advance into Mālwa,

of the Kazilbūshes were slain and the house was set on fire and plundered. Afterwards Sultān Muẓaffar paid six lakhs of *tankaḥs* to the envoy; and sent him back to 'Irāq with many presents. The Sultān was annoyed with Šāhib Khān; and he, having received invitations from some *amīrs* of repute in Mālwa, went away without taking leave of the Sultān. The Cambridge History of India, page 317, has an entirely different story. It says that before Sultān Muẓaffar could redeem his promise to help him, Šāhib Khān left Gujārāt, owing to "the gross misconduct of the Persian ambassador, who invited him to dinner and assaulted him. The prince's servants attacked the ambassador's suite, and plundered his lodging, but the affair was noised about, and Šāhib Khān was so overcome with shame, that he fled from Gujārāt". I do not know what the authority for this version is, but the fact that the Persian ambassador was paid a large sum by Sultān Muẓaffar as compensation, and was sent off with presents and all marks of honour; and Šāhib Khān was overcome with shame and fled from Gujārāt show that the statement about the gross misconduct of the Persian ambassador is very improbable.

<sup>1</sup> They are called "Poorby Rajpoots" by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 81). According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 247, they were an army of Hindūs, collected at the instance of Sultān Maḥmūd himself, who gave their leader the title of Mēdinī Rāo. According to a note by Bayley in the same page, he "must have been a man of very remarkable, and in many respects, of a very noble and generous character". According to Rās Mālā, vol. I, page 381, "Mednee Rāee, the Hindoo minister of that prince, had, it was represented, acquired such authority, that nothing but the name of king was left to the sultan, and infidelity was, therefore, rapidly regaining its dominion". The Cambridge History of India, page 317, does not mention Mēdinī Rāy, but says that "Nāsir-ud-din of Mālwa had employed in his army a large number of Rājputs from eastern Hindustan, who had become so powerful in the kingdom, that Maḥmūd II, was a puppet in their hands".

after asking for the help of the great ones there, both dead and living. He remained in Aḥmadābād for a week; and then proceeded to Kōdhrāh (Gōdhrāh). He halted there for some days to collect his troops. In the course of these days news was brought to him, that Malik 'Ain-ul-mulk, the governor of Pattan, was coming with his retainers to wait on him, *i.e.*, the Sultān; but on the way, he received information that the <sup>1</sup> Rāja of Īdar, taking advantage of such an opportunity, had raised the dust of disturbance and rebellion in that locality; and had raided the country as far as the borders of the Sābarmatī. Malik 'Ain-ul-mulk, therefore, on account of his loyalty and devotion wanted that he should come, and attend on the Sultān after punishing him. He had therefore gone, and attacked the town of Mahrāsa. But in the meantime, the Rāja of Īdar, having collected a large force, came forward to meet him; and a great battle took place between the two armies. As Malik 'Abd-ul-mulk with two hundred men attained to martyrdom, and an elephant which he had with him was cut to pieces, 'Ain-ul-mulk being unable to stand firm fled.

On hearing this news Sultān Muẓaffar advanced towards Īdar; and when he arrived at the town of Mahrāsa, he sent an army to plunder and devastate the country. The Rāja evacuated the fort, and concealed himself in the hills <sup>2</sup> of Bijānagar. When the Sultān arrived at Īdar, there were only ten Rājput̃s, who stood there deliberately, with the intention of immolating themselves and were <sup>3</sup> barbarously and cruelly slain. They left no vestige of any building

<sup>1</sup> His name according to Firishtah was Bhīm Rāy. He also describes 'Abu-ul-mulk as a *sardār*, and Col. Briggs calls him an officer of distinction. According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 249, Abd-ul-Mulk was the brother of 'Ain-ul-Mulk. Bayley says, in a note on page 249, that according to the *Tabakāt*, 'Ain-ul-Mulk lost forty men. This is not correct according to the MSS. or the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt* or the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* or Col. Briggs, according to all of whom 200 men were slain. The *Cambridge History of India*, page 317, agrees with the text.

<sup>2</sup> So called in both MSS. and in lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 81) has "Beesalnuggur". The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* and the *Cambridge History of India* and *Rās Mālā* all say went to the hills or hill country.

<sup>3</sup> The words are *بمذلت و خواری کشته شدند*. I am not quite sure that my translation is quite correct. It sounds rather offensive.

or temple or garden or trees. The Rāja came forward with great humility; and sending <sup>1</sup> Malik Kōbī Zunnārdār (Brahman), to wait on the Sultān; and prayed for pardon. He sent a message to the effect that Malik 'Ain-ul-mulk, owing to the great enmity which he had against this slave, had come and plundered his country; and owing to his distress this helpless one had committed certain acts. If he has committed any offence, he was deserving of the anger and wrath of the Sultān. He was sending <sup>2</sup> twenty *lakhs* of *tankas* and a hundred horses by the hand of the *vakils*. As the conquest of Mālwa was in the forefront of the Sultān's spirit, he accepted the Rāja's excuses, and returned to Kōdhrāh. He bestowed the twenty *lakhs* of *tankas* and the hundred horses on 'Ain-ul-mulk, so that he might equip his men.

He sent Shāhzāda Sikandar Khān from Kōdhrāh to act as the governor of Muḥammadābād. When he arrived in the town of Dahūd he ordered Qaiṣar Khān, that he should take possession of the country as far as the village of <sup>3</sup> Dēvla, which was in the possession of Sultān

<sup>1</sup> The name is Kōpā in both MSS. and Malik Kōpī in the lith. ed. It is Malik Gōpāl in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and Mudun Gopal in Col. Briggs's (vol. IV, p. 82). The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 249, has Malik Kōbī a Brahman and a minister of the Sultān in the text, and this is corroborated by Bayley who says in a note, that he was really a minister of Muzaffar Khān and "he will be found often mentioned in the sequel". He is not mentioned at all in the Cambridge History of India. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has ملک کوپا in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> It is twenty *lakhs* and eight *lakhs* of *tankas* respectively in the two MSS., and eight lakhs of rupees in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has twenty *lakhs* of *tankas* which is equivalent to two thousand *tūmāns*. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī does not give the amount; but Bayley says in a note that the Tārīkh-i-Alfī says that it was twenty *lakhs* of *tankas* (equivalent to two thousand *tūmāns*). Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 82) has "two hundred thousand *tunkas*"; and the Cambridge History of India (p. 317) has eight hundred thousand rupees.

<sup>3</sup> The place is دیوالہ in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt it is دیوالہ Dilwāla. Col. Briggs has "the town of Dydlā". The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 250, has "the pass of Dēōlah which is very difficult". The Cambridge History of India, page 317, has Deolī near the Mālī and in a note in 22° 57' North and 74° 58' East. The Cambridge History of India goes on to say that the Sultān had now changed his intention of aiding Malunūd by crushing the Rājputs, and had formed

Maḥmūd Khaljī's men. After that he advanced towards Dhārāgarh. On the way the <sup>1</sup> son of Harkhūkhā, who was a resident of Dhār, came and waited on the Sultān; and begged for quarter for the people of the city. The Sultān gave him assurances of safety; and sent Qawām-ul-mulk (son of Qawām-ul-mulk) and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk, son of 'Imād-ul-mulk, in advance of himself, to reassure and encourage the citizens of Dhār. At this time intelligence came that Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī <sup>2</sup> had been left alone; and the *amīrs* of Chandēri had risen against him; and he had gone towards that place. Sultān Muẓaffar summoned back his *amīrs*, and told them, "My object in undertaking this expedition was really that I should drive away the *Pūrabīa Kāfirs*; and divide the kingdom equally between Sultān Maḥmūd and Šāhib Khān, the sons of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn. Now that Sultān Maḥmūd has gone to put down the *amīrs* of Chandēri, and has taken away the tyrannical Rājput̃s with him, it would be removed from the rules of humanity, and the customs of brave men, to enter his country".

Qawām-ul-mulk, who had now joined the Sultān, reported to the latter something of the <sup>3</sup> beauties of the deer-park of Dhār; and made him desirous and anxious to see the place, and to enjoy the pleasures of the chase. Sultān Muẓaffar left Qawām-ul-mulk, to guard the

the design of conquering and annexing Mālwa. I have nowhere found any evidence of such a change of mind. All his acts culminating in the restoration of Mandū to Sultān Maḥmūd, after it had been recovered from the Rājput̃s in 924 A.H. (1518 A.D.), show that there was no such change. It is true that Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī had great fear about Sultān Muẓaffar's intentions, but Mandū was restored to him; and Sultān Muẓaffar returned to Gujrāt.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah says چون مردم دهار باستقبال آمده امن خواستند, and does not name anyone as the spokesman of the people of Dhār. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 250, says the son of the head man of Dhār came.

<sup>2</sup> The words in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. are بخود در ماندند the meaning of which is not clear. There are no similar words in Firishtah, who says that Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī had gone to crush the *amīrs* of Chandēri, who had risen against him. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 250, also says that Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī and Mēdinī Rāō had gone towards Chāndēri.

<sup>3</sup> The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 251, says "gave such a glowing description of the buildings of the deer-park, which had been formed there under the orders of Sultān Ghīās-ud-dīn", etc.

camp; and with <sup>1</sup> two thousand horsemen and one hundred and fifty elephants proceeded to Dhār. When he arrived there, he mounted the same afternoon, to go on a pilgrimage to the tombs of Shaikh 'Abd-ul-lah Jangāl and Shaikh Kamāl-ud-dīn Mālwi. It is said that in the time of Rāja Bhōj Shaikh 'Abd-ul-lah had the name of *Pandey Brij*, and was his *vazir*; and because of inclination having accepted Islām, attained to spiritual greatness by pious exertions and exercises. In short the Sultān, <sup>2</sup> having in the neighbourhood of Dhār given leave to Nizām-ul-mulk so that he might hunt in the neighbourhood of Dilāwara. Nizām-ul-mulk passed through Dilāwara, and went to Na'leha; and when he was returning, a <sup>3</sup> body of *Pūrabīa Rājputs* came on and obstructed him, and they obtained their deserts; as is mentioned in the section about Mālwa. Sultān Muzaḥḥar on being apprised of this occurrence, was very angry with, and reprimanded Nizām-ul-mulk, for it was his only object, that this year he should simply see the country and return; and acts like these which had been committed by Nizām-ul-mulk <sup>4</sup> caused him much thought. The Sultān then turned back, and marched towards Gujrāt, and took up his quarters at Muḥammadābād Chāmpānir.

In the month of Shawwāl in the year 921 A.H. (1515 A.D.), as after the death of <sup>5</sup> Rāy Bhīm, Rāja of Īdar, Rānā Sānkā had come to

<sup>1</sup> It is two thousand in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of Firishah, and in Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 82); but the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 251, has "twelve thousand light horse".

<sup>2</sup> According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, the Sultān did not give Nizām-ul-Mulk permission to return, but he told him and some others to go and see the deer park. They did not return; and the Sultān was informed later on, that Nizām-ul-Mulk had probably gone to Na'leha to see his brother, (who apparently was a Hindū and named Rāi Singh) who dwelt there. It appears from the *Cambridge History of India*, page 318, that Nizām-ul-Mulk was a son of Rāja Putāl (or Rāy Batāl of Chāmpānir).

<sup>3</sup> According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 252, they "came from Mandū and pursued him. Nizām-ul-Mulk faced about, and fought. Forty of the infidels were killed, and the rest fled back to Mandū".

<sup>4</sup> The actual words are باعث مشغولی خاطر میگشت.

<sup>5</sup> It appears that Rāy Bhīm was the younger son of Rāy Bhīm, and he had dispossessed his elder brother. Rāy Mal was the son of the latter, and having now grown to man's estate claimed the throne. The *Cambridge History of India*, page 318, calls Rāi Mal the brother-in-law of Rānā Sānkā. The



the aid of Rāy Mal, son of Sūraj Mal, who was his son-in-law, and had invaded the country and having taken it and the fort of Īdar, from the possession of Bihār Mal, son of Rāy Bhīm, had made it over to Rāy Mal, Sultān Muẓaffār appointed Nizām-ul-mulk, that he should recover the country from Rāy Mal and make it over to Bihār Mal. He himself proceeded towards Ahmadnagar. On the way, when Bihār Mal joined Nizām-ul-mulk, the latter brought him to have the honour of waiting upon the Sultān. From that station, the Sultān left Khudāwand Khān and Nizām-ul-mulk to guard the camp; and went to Pattan. He conferred favours on the residents of the city in general and on the wise and learned men in special; and coming back joined the camp. He then sent Bihār Mal with Nizām-ul-mulk and granted leave to the latter to go and recover possession of Īdar from Rāy Mal and make it over to Bihār Mal. After Nizām-ul-mulk had made over possession of Īdar to Bihār Mal, Rāy Mal retired for protection to the hills of Bijūnagar. Nizām-ul-mulk pursued him, and fought with him; and many people were slain on both sides. When this news reached Sultān Muẓaffār he sent an order (to the effect) that, as the country of Īdar had been recovered, the act of going to Bijūnagar, and fighting a battle there was the cause of a number of soldiers being slain without any necessity; and it was right that he (Nizām-ul-mulk) should return that very day.

After the return of Nizām-ul-mulk the Sultān came from Ahmadnagar to Ahmadābād. He arranged a great entertainment, and cele-

---

Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah call him Rānū Sānkū's *dāmād* or son-in-law; and Rās Mālū, vol. 1, page 382, says expressly that he had married the daughter of "Sung Rānū of Chector". The Cambridge History of India also says that Rānū Sānkū "welcomed the opportunity of asserting his ill-founded claim to supremacy over all Rājput princes", but surely he could support his own brother-in-law, without any such ulterior motive. In fact Sultān Muẓaffār had about as much or as little right to interfere as Rānū Sānkū.

<sup>1</sup> It is Bijūnagar in the MSS., and in the lith. ed.; and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but Col. Briggs has the Beesuhuggur territory; and the Cambridge History of India, page 318, has the Bichabhara hills. The Mirāt-i-Sikandurī does not mention the incidents, but Bayley quotes from the Tūrikh-i-Aḥī and the Tabakāt; but the hills are not mentioned in the quotations. Rās Mālū (vol. I, p. 382) says "the hills". It mentions Veeshuhuggur later in connection with the Sultān's order to Malik Noosrut-ool-Moolk to plunder and lay waste the country, which is described as the "receptacle of renegadoes and the asylum of rebels" (p. 383).

brated the marriages of <sup>1</sup> Shāhẓādas Sikandar Khān, Bahādur Khān and Latīf Khān. He bestowed favours on the *amīrs* and the well-known men of the city, giving them horses and robes of honour. After the rains he advanced towards Īdar to see the country, and to hunt there. As Nizām-ul-mulk was ill, he left physicians to attend to him; and in the early part of 923 A.H., he went to Muḥammadābād Chāmpānīr. From that place he sent Malik Naṣrat-ul-mulk to Īdar, and summoned Nizām-ul-mulk to his presence. Before the arrival of Naṣrat-ul-mulk, Nizām-ul-mulk left Ẓahīr-ul-mulk at Īdar with a hundred horsemen; and on wings of speed and <sup>2</sup> steps of eagerness came to Muḥammadābād. Naṣrat-ul-mulk was still in the neighbourhood, when Rāy Mal, seizing the opportunity, advanced on Īdar. <sup>3</sup> Ẓahīr-ul-mulk, in spite of the small number of his friends and the vast number of his enemies, advanced to meet him, and was slain with twenty-seven of his men. When this news reached Sultān Muẓaffar he sent a *farmān* to Malik Naṣrat-ul-mulk, to invade and devastate as far as <sup>4</sup> Bijānagar, which had become an asylum of the disturbers of the peace, and the shelter of rebels.

About this time His Holiness <sup>5</sup> Shaikh Jāildah, who was the first man of his time (in learning, etc.), and <sup>6</sup> Ḥabīb Khān the

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. says the Sultān celebrated the marriage of Shāhẓāda Sikandar Khān, but does not mention the other two; and the marriages do not appear to be mentioned anywhere else.

<sup>2</sup> The words اقدام شوق are left out in one MS., but are to be found in the other and in the lith. ed.

<sup>3</sup> The other histories agree; but Col. Briggs has a totally incorrect account. He says (vol. IV, p. 83) "Zeheer-ool-Moolk marched against him, but was killed at the head of the cavalry; on which occasion two hundred and seven men fell, and the Guzeratties were defeated".

<sup>4</sup> See note 1, page 300. The Cambridge History of India (p. 319), which had a few lines before called the Bijānagar or Visālnagar hills, the Bichabhera hills now gives them an entirely different name, viz., the Vajinagar hills.

<sup>5</sup> The name is written in one MS. as جاعلده , and in the lith. ed. as جالندها. Firishtah lith. ed. has شيخ حامد , and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 84) has "Sheikh Humeed of Bhilsa". The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 253, has Shekh Jābulandah. Neither Rās Mālā nor the Cambridge History of India mentions him. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Ḥosain has used جالندها.

<sup>6</sup> There is no doubt about his name; but the name of his fief is اشته نگر in the MSS., and داشته است نگر in the lith. ed. Firishtah calls him حبیب خان

fendatory of Ashtanagar fled from Mandū on account of the violence of the Pūrabīa Rājput̃s and waited on the Sultān, and <sup>1</sup> complained of the great power which they had acquired. <sup>2</sup> A few days later, a representation came from the *dārōgha* of Dahūd that Sultān Maḥmūd Khiljī had become alarmed at the great power of the Pūrabīa Rājput̃s, and had come praying for help. As he had arrived at the village of Bhakōr, which was situated on the boundary of Gujrāt, this slave (i.e., he himself) had waited on him, and as far as lay in his power, had left nothing undone in rendering service to him. Sultān Muẓaffar was pleased on hearing of these incidents: and he sent tents and a red pavilion with necessary equipages and many beautiful gifts and presents and all that is specially reserved for *bādshāhs* by the hand of Qaiṣar Khān; and he himself advanced to welcome Sultān Maḥmūd. They met in the village of <sup>3</sup> Dēvla. Sultān Muẓaffar did everything to please his guest, and exhorted him not to be much distressed owing to the separation from his children and his kingdom, as before long

---

مقطع but does not give the name of his chief. Col. Briggs (vol. IV. p. 84) calls him "Hubeeb Khan the Kazy of Choly Meheswur; and explains the last words by saying in a note "properly Maha-Iswur". The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* does not give any designation of Habīb Khān: but Bayley in a note on page 253 says that the *Tabakūt-i-Akhari* calls him governor of Ashta or Ashtanagar. داشتند in the text-edition.

<sup>1</sup> The purport of the complaints is given in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*. Bayley, page 253.

<sup>2</sup> The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*. Bayley, pages 254, 255, describes at some length the way in which Sultān Maḥmūd Khiljī escaped with his favourite wife Rānī Kanākrū (Bayley says in a note Kanākrū means golden) on two horses provided by Kishnā, a Rājput *zamīndār*, who was also one of his guards. The village to which Sultān Maḥmūd Khiljī came is called Bhakūrah in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*.

<sup>3</sup> What follows is copied almost word for word by Firishtah, but the name of the village where the two sovereigns met is دیواله in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. The account given in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 255, is similar, but it appears from it that the name of the *dārōgha* or governor, as he is called by Bayley, was Kaisar Khān. The presents mentioned in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* are also different. They consisted of horses and elephants and male and female attendants. The account in the *Cambridge History of India*, page 319, is similar, but Qaisar Khān is described as a Gujarāt noble, and the presents are somewhat different, and the village to which Sultān Maḥmūd Khiljī came is called Bhāgor.

with divine help he would be able to destroy the Pārābās, and purify the kingdom of all disturbances and rebellions, and restore it to his servants (euphemism for himself). He halted at the place, and gave orders for the mustering of his troops, and in a short time an immense army advanced into Mālwa.

When Mēdinī Rāy received information of the advance of Sultān Muẓaffār, he left <sup>1</sup> Rāy Pithōrā with a body of Rājput̃s in the fort of Mandū; and himself with two thousand Rājput̃ horsemen and the elephants belonging to Sultān Maḥmūd proceeded to Dhār. From that place he went to Rānā Sānkā to bring him to his aid. Sultān Muẓaffār advanced to Mandū with the object of laying siege to it. When the army arrived near Mandū, the Rājput̃s sallied out, and fought with great bravery; but in the end, they fled and took shelter in the fort. The next day also the Rājput̃s came out and fought a great battle. Qawām-ul-mulk exerted himself in a notable way and slew many Rājput̃s. That day Sultān Muẓaffār divided the different sides of the fort, and entrusted them to the *amīrs*, and made the siege closer. At this time Mēdinī Rāy sent a letter to Rāy Pithōrā, and informed him, "I have come to Rānā Sānkā, and I am bringing him with all the Rājput̃s of Mārwar and the neighbouring country. You should keep Sultān Muẓaffār inactive for the period of one month by tales and excuses". Rāy Pithōrā with great deceit and trickery sent <sup>2</sup> emissaries with the following message, "As the fort of Mandū has for a long time been in the possession of the Rājput̃s, and they have got their families and dependants in it, they would be able to remove them and vacate the fort in the course of a month, and would then make it over to him; and they would also hasten to his service and become his loyal adherents, if he would go back, and take up a station

---

<sup>1</sup> The name is spell in different ways in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., but the correct spelling appears to be what I have adopted in the text. Pithōrā, as the reader will remember, was the name given by the Musalmān historians to the celebrated Prithī Rāj of Dehlī. The Rāy Pithōrā in the present case appears to have been a son of Mēdinī Rāy. According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 256, Mēdinī Rāo sent Shādī Khān, Pithōrā and three other Hīndūs to hold the fort of Mandū, but according to most historians the command was confided to Rāy Pithōrā. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 84) calls him Bhew Ray.

<sup>2</sup> According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, the emissaries went to Khudāwand Khān the *vazīr*, and he took them to the Sultān.

one stage behind his present position". Although Sultān Muẓaffar knew that these people were merely temporizing and were waiting for reinforcements, still as the sons and other relations of Sultān Maḥmūd were in the fort, he had no other alternative, except to agree to their prayer; and he went and took up a position three *karōhs* further back.

At this station, <sup>1</sup> 'Ādil Khān, the ruler of Āsir and Burhānpūr, arrived with a fresh army and joined the Sultān. At this time news came to the latter, that Mēdinī Rāy had given <sup>2</sup> some elephants and much gold to Rānā Sānkā, and had brought him to aid and reinforce his men; and they had arrived in the neighbourhood of Ujjain. The noble spirit of Sultān Muẓaffar was now aroused, and he sent 'Ādil Khān Fārūqī, the ruler of Āsir and Burhānpūr and Qawām-ul-mulk Sultānī to attack Rānā Sānkā; and himself began anew the siege of the fort of Mandū. He devoted all his energy to it, so that the fort might be taken before the battle with Rānā Sānkā took place; and <sup>3</sup> he stationed the *amīrs* and the leaders of the different bodies, at the various stations round the fort. On the morning following the night of the 14th Ṣafar, 924 A.H., (the Musalmāns) came in crowds from all sides of the fort, and attacked it; and placing ladders (against the wall) entered the fort. The Rājput̃s performed *jauhar* and set fire to their houses, and killed their families and children, and burnt some of them, and then commenced fighting, and fought as long as they had any life left in them. Sultān Muẓaffar entered the fort and ordered a general massacre. It has been stated correctly that on that day

---

<sup>1</sup> He was Sultān Muẓaffar's nephew and son-in-law.

<sup>2</sup> These were some of the elephants belonging to Sultān Maḥmūd which Mēdinī Rāy took with him.

<sup>3</sup> The operations are differently described by Firishtah, who says that for four days continuous attacks were made, so that the garrison had no sleep or rest. On the 5th night there was a cessation of assaults, and the garrison became careless. Then when midnight came, the soldiers went with ladders; and as they found the men in the citadel asleep, they mounted to the top of the ramparts, and slew the guards at the gate. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 85) says that false attacks were made on the first four nights; and the garrison being worn out with fatigue, on the fifth night ladders were applied and Mando fell. The Cambridge History of India, page 319, says, "On February 23rd, 1518, the day of the Hindu festival of the Holi, Māndū was carried by escalade".



waited on him. After they had finished eating, he placed presents of all kinds before Sultān Muẓaffar and the Shāhzādas; and again made his excuses. Sultān Muẓaffar then saw all the palaces and other buildings of the former Sultāns of Mālwa; and afterwards went back to Dhār. There he bade adieu to Sultān Maḥmūd, and leaving Āṣaf Khān Gujrāti with ten thousand horsemen to reinforce him, started for Gujrāt. Sultān Maḥmūd owing to his great affection accompanied him as far as *mauḍa* Dēvla, although Sultān Muẓaffar had already said farewell to him; and there, after again taking leave of him, returned to Mandū.

On his arrival in Gujrāt, Sultān Muẓaffar remained for some days in Muḥammadābād Chāmpānīr; and the great and noble men of the country of Gujrāt hastened to wait on him, with their felicitations and congratulations; and were made happy with his largesses and favours. At this time, one day one of his courtiers reported to him, that at the time, when the shadow of his conquest had been spread over the kindgom of Mālwa, Rāy Māl, Rāja of Īdar had come out of the hills of Bijānagar, and had raided a part of the country of Pattan and the town of <sup>1</sup> Gilwāra; but as Naṣrat-ul-mulk left Īdar, and advanced to give him battle, he fled and concealed himself in the caves of Bijānagar. The Sultān declared, "God willing, I will, after the rains, determine what to do in this matter". After the rains in the year 925 A.H., 1519 A.D., he advanced towards Īdar to chastise and punish Rāy Māl, and other disturbers of peace. As <sup>2</sup> Rāja Māl was the protector and the asylum of Rāy Māl, the Sultān thought that the chastisement of the former should be undertaken first; and he levelled his territory to the dust; and after halting at Īdar for a few days, he came back to Muḥammadābād Chāmpānīr and stayed there.

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the town is کهرالو and کهرالوار in the MSS., and کهرالو in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has قصبات انحدود without giving any names. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 87) has the town of Gilwara. I cannot find any mention of it in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari and the Cambridge History of India, but Rās Mālū (vol. I, p. 383) agrees with Col. Briggs and calls it Gilwārā. کهراله in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> The name is راجه مال Rāja Māl in both MSS., but it is راجه مالديو Rāja Māl Dēv in the lith. ed. Firishtah calls him راجه مل Rāja Māl. I cannot find him or his territory mentioned anywhere else.

After a few days, news came that Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji had, in concert with Āsaf Khān marched against <sup>1</sup> Bhīm Karan Pārabiā, with the object of seizing <sup>2</sup> Kākṛūn, when Mēdinī Rāy brought Rānā Sānkā to aid him, and a great battle took place. Most of the *amīrs* of Mālwa were slain; and Āsaf Khān's son and a number of other warriors were also killed. Sultān Maḥmūd received many wounds, and was taken prisoner. Rānā Sānkā, however, treated him with kindness; and sent him with a body of troops to Mandū. Sultān Muẓaffar hearing this news became depressed and sad; and sent some other *sardārs* to Sultān Maḥmūd's aid, and wrote an affectionate letter inquiring about him. About this time, Sultān Muẓaffar went to Īdar to see the country and to enjoy the pleasures of the chase; and commenced erecting some buildings there. On his return, he brought Naṣrat-ul-mulk to Aḥmadābād with him; and entrusted the government of Īdar to Malik Mubārīz-ul-mulk.

It so happened, that one day a bard or wandering minstrel waited on Mubārīz-ul-mulk, and said something about the bravery of Rānā Sānkā. Mubārīz-ul-mulk, on account of his great arrogance and pride, spoke to him in improper language; and giving <sup>3</sup> a dog the name of Rānā Sānkā, kept him tied up at the gate of Īdar. The bard went back, and told this story to Rānā Sānkā. The Rānā owing to his pride and <sup>4</sup> boorishness turned towards Īdar, and advanced and

<sup>1</sup> There is no mention of Bhīm Karan or Kākṛūn in any other history, except the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* (Bayley, page 263) where it is said that Sultān Maḥmūd marched to *sarkār* Gāgrūn, where he attacked Bhīm Karan; and it is said in a note "that Bhīm Karan is said to have been a deputy of Mēdinī Rāy, and was holding Gāgrūn (?) for him. He was certainly one of his chief officers and very probably a relative". Evidently some lines have been left out in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*. Col. Briggs, the *Cambridge History of India and Rās Mūla*, all say that Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji had attacked the combined forces of Mēdinī Rāy and Rānā Sānkā, and had been defeated by them.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has قلعه before Kākṛūn, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. do not have it.

<sup>3</sup> The *Cambridge History of India*, page 320, says that Mubārīz-ul-Mulk called the dog Sangrama. I am afraid Sangrama, or the more correct Sangrāma would have been Greek to Mubārīz-ul-Mulk. I doubt whether Rānā Sangrām Singh's parents or he himself ever called himself Sangrama or Sangrāma. Sangrūn was quite sufficient for them.

<sup>4</sup> The word used is جالیت, but it appears to me to be extremely inappropriate and unjust.



ravaged the country to the boundary of Sirōhī. About this time Sultān Muẓaffar went to Chāmpānīr, leaving Qiwām-ul-mulk, son of Qiwām-ul-mulk, in Aḥmadābād, for the control of the <sup>1</sup> *grāsias*. <sup>2</sup> When Rānā Sānkū arrived in the country of <sup>3</sup> Bākar, the Rāja, although he was obedient and submissive to Sultān Muẓaffar, in his fear and distress joined Rānā Sānkū. The latter then came to Dūn-garpūr. Mubārīz-ul-mulk wrote an account of what had happened to the Sultān. As the Sultān's *vazīrs* were not friendly to Mubārīz-ul-mulk they told the Sultān that it was not <sup>4</sup> right for him to give the Rānā's name to a dog, and thus bring him into contempt; and afterwards being afraid of him, to ask for reinforcement; otherwise the Rānā would not have dared to put his foot into the Sultān's territories. It so happened, however, that at that time, the army which had been left to protect Īdar had, on account of the <sup>5</sup> excessive rains gone to their own homes at Aḥmadābād and only a small number had remained with Mubārīz-ul-mulk.

<sup>1</sup> *Grās* according to a note on page 98 of the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* comprises (1) blackmail paid to powerful local chiefs for protection and immunity from plunder, or rather land held in lieu of such blackmail; (2) lands or allowances allotted by government, or allowed to be retained by them to land-holders, both as a politic measure to keep them quiet, and as a retainer for military and other services. Here apparently the word is used to mean the holders of such land.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah's account agrees generally with the text; but he says that Rānā Sānkū plundered and ravaged Mubārīz-ul-mulk's fief before coming to Bākar; and he also says that the Sultān on hearing what his *vazīrs* told him delayed sending in reinforcements. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* (Bayley, p. 264) gives a detailed account of Nizām-ul-Mulk's talk with the bard, Rānā Sānkū's march against Īdar and the former's prayer for reinforcement, and the action of the Sultān's minister about it, down to the battle of Aḥmadābād and the sack of that city. Its version of the story of the dog is somewhat different from that in the other histories. It is said, that in the talk with the bard, Nizām-ul-Mulk repeatedly called the Rānā a dog, and finally he called for a dog, and having had it tied up at the door of the *darbār*, he said, "If the Rānā does not come he will be like this dog".

<sup>3</sup> Called Bāgar in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 266, and Bagry by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 88).

<sup>4</sup> The word is لایق in one MS. and in the lith. ed., but مناسب in the other MS.

<sup>5</sup> One MS. inserts برسات before باران و .

Rānā Sānkā becoming cognizant of all these things, advanced against Īdar. When he arrived near, Mubārīz-ul-mulk with the other *sardārs* prepared for battle, and went out to meet him; but before the two armies should come together, they turned back and returned to Īdar. The *sardārs* said that the small number of their friends and the vast host of their enemies were patent to all. It was advisable that they should go to Aḥmadnagar and fortify themselves there, till the arrival of the reinforcements; and on this decision they went to the fort of Aḥmadnagar, taking Mubārīz-ul-mulk with them, whether he liked it or not. On the following morning Rānā Sānkā arrived at Īdar, and enquired about Mubārīz-ul-mulk. The *grāssias*, who had fled from Qawām-ul-mulk, and had joined the Rānā told him that Mubārīz-ul-mulk was not a man that would run away, but the *amīrs* had taken him away to Aḥmadnagar; and they were waiting for reinforcements. Rānā Sānkā then advanced against Aḥmadnagar with a large force. The hard who had praised Rānā Sānkā in the presence of Mubārīz-ul-mulk again went to the latter; and said, "Rānā Sānkā has come with a large army. It would be a great pity that men like you should be killed for nothing. It is advisable that you should remain in the fort of Aḥmadnagar. The Rānā <sup>1</sup> would return after giving his horse a drink of water below the fort, and he would not do anything more". Mubārīz-ul-mulk said in reply, "It is impossible that I should allow him to give water to his horse in this river." He thereupon with great bravery crossed the river with the few men that were with him; and who were not a tenth part of the number of the Rānā's army. When the Rānā arrived there, there was a great battle. Asad Khān who was one of the commanders was killed with a number of other horsemen. Šafdar Khān was wounded; and Mubārīz-ul-mulk, after making several attacks on the Rānā's troops, received many wounds; and <sup>2</sup> most of the Gujrātīs

---

<sup>1</sup> To show, I suppose, that he had come as far as the fort and Mubārīz-ul-mulk had not dared to come out. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 89) says, "till his horse drank out of the ditch of Aḥmadnagar"; but I suppose, and the next sentence shows, that he meant the river which flows below the city and the fort.

<sup>2</sup> The clause is as I have it in the text in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed., but it appears to be redundant. Firishtah inserts چون before اکثر and omits the و after شدند. This improves the clause a great deal. The meaning of the

were slain. Mubārīz-ul-mulk and Šafdar Khān now retired to Aḥmadābād. The Rānā ravaged Aḥmadnagar, and halted there for one day. The next morning he <sup>1</sup> marched towards Badnagar. When he arrived near it, most of the inhabitants came to him and said, "We are *zunnārdārs* (men with the sacred thread, Brahmans) and your forefathers have always respected and honoured us". Rānā Sānkā <sup>2</sup> desisted from attacking and plundering Badnagar and advanced to <sup>3</sup> Bēsalnagar. <sup>4</sup> Malik Ḥatim the *thānadār* of the place came out with the resolution of becoming a martyr; and gave him battle; and attained his object. Rānā Sānkā after ravaging Bēsalnagar returned to his own country.

---

amended elause is, as most of the Gujrātīs were slain Mubārīz-ul-mulk and Šafdar Khān retired to Aḥmadābād.

<sup>1</sup> The readings are different. One MS. has متوجه بدنگر کردید, marched towards Badnagar. The other has عاظم بدنگر کردید. The lith. ed. has متوجه بدنگر و مسلنگر کردید. Firishtah has متوجه بدنگر گردید. I have adopted this, as it agrees with the reading in the first MS. The place is called Barnagar in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* and Vadnagar in the *Cambridge History of India*, page 320. I do not know why and how بدنگر has been transformed into Vadnagar. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 269, says that the *grāssiahs* incited the Rānā to plunder Barnagar, as the inhabitants of the place were merchants, and who were very rich; but the Rānā did not on the representation of the inhabitants, as stated in the text, allow the place to be plundered.

<sup>2</sup> The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* and the *Cambridge History of India* say that Rānā Sānkā accepted tribute from the people; but neither the *Ṭabaqāt* nor *Firishtah* says so. A Brahman who has always called himself a mendicant is not likely to have paid much tribute.

<sup>3</sup> The place is written like بیسلنگر Bēsalnagar in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* it looks like Bēlnagar. Col. Briggs has Beesalnuggur. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 269, has Bisalnagar. The *Cambridge History of India*, page 320, has Visnagar. I think Bēsalnagar is identical with the hills of Bijānāgar, to which the Rājās of Īdar used to escape whenever hard pressed by the Sultāns of Gujrāt; and which the *Cambridge History of India* had in previous pages called Bichabhera (page 318) and Vajinagar hills (page 319) and now gives it the entirely new name of Visnagar (see notes 1, page 300 and 3, page 301). بیلنگر Bēlnagar in the text-edition.

<sup>4</sup> Contrary to what is stated here, and in *Firishtah*, the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 269, says, he shut himself in the fort and it was beleaguered till the hour of evening prayer, and in the fighting and confusion the town was plundered.

<sup>1</sup> Malik Qawām-ul-mulk sent a detachment with Mubāriz-ul-mulk and Šafdar Khān to Aḥmadnagar that they might bury the dead. Mubāriz-ul-mulk arrived at Aḥmadnagar, and buried the martyrs. About this time the <sup>2</sup> *kōlis* and *grāssias* from the neighbourhood of Īdar, seeing the small force under Mubāriz-ul-mulk's command, attacked him. Mubāriz-ul-mulk came out of the fort and fought with them; and after slaying sixty-one of the leaders of the *grāssias*, returned victorious and triumphant to Aḥmadnagar. As Aḥmadnagar, however, was in ruin, <sup>3</sup> and the people suffered privations for want of grain and all other necessities, they started from there; and came to the <sup>4</sup> town of Parāntēj.

When news of all these events reached Sultān Muẓaffar, the latter appointed <sup>5</sup> 'Imād-ul-mulk and Qaišar Khān with an enormous army and one hundred elephants to crush Rānā Sānkā. 'Imād-ul-mulk and Qaišar Khān arrived at Aḥmadābād, and taking Qawām-ul-mulk with them went to Parāntēj. From that place, they wrote to the Sultān, that Rānā Sānkā had returned to his own country, and asked

<sup>1</sup> The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 270, gives a fairly detailed account of how Kiwām-ul-Mulk started to reinforce Mubāriz-ul-Mulk, how he heard of the latter's defeat, and sent for him with the object of going in pursuit, but hearing that this was impossible, sent Mubāriz-ul-Mulk to bury the dead, and this was done sixteen days after the battle.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah agrees with the text; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 90) says that the Kolies and Girasias attacked Moebariz-ool-Moolk on the march to Ahmudnuggur, but were defeated. Rās Mālā also says so. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 270, says that the Kōlls of Kanth came to carry off grain from Ahmadnagar.

<sup>3</sup> There is no و in this place in the MS. or in the lith. ed.; but I have inserted it as it is required to complete the sense.

<sup>4</sup> The name appears to be وحنج, Wahinj, and دھنج, Dahōj in the MS., and هنج, Hēch in the lith. ed. and رھنج, Rahōj in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*. Col. Briggs has Puranty. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 270, has Parāntij and Rās Mālā has Poorāntēj. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the matter. I have adopted Parāntēj. M. Hidayat Ḥosain, however, has دھنج, Dahij in the text-edition.

<sup>5</sup> There are slight variations in the readings. The lith. ed. has زنجیر before فیل but the MSS. omit the words; and one MS. and the lith. ed. have برسر رانا سانکا, but the other MS. has بدفع رانا سانکا.

for permission to march to Chitōr. The Sultān wrote in reply, that as the rains had commenced they should wait in Aḥmadnagar; and after the rains should advance towards Chitōr. The *amīrs*, in accordance with this order remained at Aḥmadnagar. Sultān Muḥaffar paid the soldiers a year's wages from the treasury; and <sup>1</sup> went to Aḥmadābād. He intended to march to Chitōr himself to chastise Rānā Sānkā.

At this time <sup>2</sup> Malik Ayāz Sultānī came from Sōrath with a large army; and after rendering homage represented that the <sup>3</sup> imperial grandeur of the Sultān is higher and more exalted, than that he should go in person to punish and chastise Rānā Sānkā. The training of slaves like myself is for the purpose, that if a work like this has to be done, the Sultān should not have to take the trouble to do it. In the month of Muḥarram in the year 927 A.H. (December, 1520 A.D.) Sultān Muḥaffar arrived at Aḥmadnagar. When the army had all collected Malik Ayāz <sup>4</sup> again prayed (that he should be employed)

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. agrees with the text, but the place where the *amīrs* remained is called سرکچ Sarkach, or Sarkhēj; and calls the Rānā's capital Jaipūr instead of Chitōr. He also says that the Sultān ordered the payment of one year's wages to the soldiers. Col. Briggs has a different account. He says Imad-ool-Moolk and Keisur Khan retreated from Aḥmadnuggur, but the Sultan ordered them to remain there during the rains; and he intended to advance to Chittoor in person after the rains. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 271, says that the allowances of the whole army were increased from ten to twenty per cent., and a year's pay was issued from the treasury, so that every man might provide himself with all that was requisite for the campaign.

<sup>2</sup> According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 233, Malik Aīāz "was originally a purchased slave, yet he attained to the rule of provinces, and to unlimited wealth". Bayley also says in a note that some authorities declare he was a renegade Portuguese, but this assertion seems opposed to such an origin. He was possibly a slave brought from the southern provinces of Europe or Asia Minor or Armenia by the Turks. But contrary to this Firishtah says ایاز خاص بود سلطانی که از غلامان پدرش بود; and Col. Briggs has "originally a slave born in the king's family" (vol. IV, p. 90).

<sup>3</sup> In the corresponding passage, Firishtah has a و between کبرای and جلال.

<sup>4</sup> This would be somewhat impertinent on his part, but Firishtah says, that when he made the request on the previous occasion, the Sultān did not give any reply.

to chastise Rānū Sānkā. The Sultān sent him for that purpose with one *lakh* horsemen, and a hundred elephants. He also sent <sup>1</sup> Qawām-ul-mulk with twenty thousand horsemen, a little later to join Malik Ayāz. When the two commanders encamped at Mahrāsa, the Sultān with great caution and farsight sent Tāj Khān and Nizām-ul-mulk Sultāni also to that place (to join them). Malik Ayāz sent a representation to the Sultān, in which he submitted, that the act of sending so many great *amīrs* for the punishment of Rānū Sānkā would be a reason for his pride and glorification. He also reported that so many elephants were not at all necessary; and that this slave (*i.e.*, he himself), owing to the grandeur of His Majesty, was quite sufficient for this service; and after <sup>2</sup> sending back most of the elephants, he marched from Mahrāsa, and encamped at the village of <sup>3</sup> Dhōl. From that place many detachments were sent out to plunder and ravage the country. Šafdar Khān was sent from here, to chastise the Rājputs of <sup>4</sup> Lakūkōt. He marched to this place, which was in a rough and uneven country, and ravaged it, and slew many Rājputs, and taking those who escaped the sword, with him as prisoners of war, re-joined Malik Ayāz. They marched from that place, and having burnt down, and rased to the ground Dūngarpūr and Bānswāla, advanced

---

<sup>1</sup> The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* says, on the authority of the *Tarikh-i-Bahādar Shāhī*, Bayley, page 272, that he had a hundred elephants in addition to one hundred thousand horsemen.

<sup>2</sup> *Firishtah* lith. ed. agrees; but Col. Briggs says that he left behind him nearly all the elephants, and the greater part of the cavalry which had lately joined (vol. IV, p. 91).

<sup>3</sup> The village is called Dhōl in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and Dadūd in the other MS. It is not mentioned by *Firishtah* or by Col. Briggs; but the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 272, calls it Dhamōlah in the district of Bāgar, but in a note which purports to be a translation of a passage of the *Tabakāt* Bayley calls it Dabāl.

<sup>4</sup> The name is لکھ کورت in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*. It is not mentioned by Col. Briggs or in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*; but Bayley translating a part of the *Tabakāt* in a note calls it Lakū Kōt. The *Cambridge History of India* (p. 320) mentions Gūliākot and Bānswāra among the five places, which were ravaged and gives the lat. and long. of each. Apparently the author had a map on a very large scale in which all these places were marked and from which their lat. and long. could be calculated. Gūliākot is probably identical with Lakīākot and Bānswāra with Bānswāla

towards Chitōr. It so happened that at this station, a man came and gave information to <sup>1</sup> Malik Ashja'-ul-mulk and Şafdar Khān, that Udaya Singh, Rāja of <sup>2</sup> Māl, had, with a body of Rājput soldiers of Rānā Sānkā and Ugar Sēn Pūrabā, come and were lying in ambush behind a hill; and they wanted to make a night attack. Ashja'-ul-mulk and Şafdar Khān without sending any information to Malik Ayāz Sultānī, galloped to that place, taking two hundred horsemen with them. There was a great battle. Ugar Sēn was wounded, and fifty Rājputs fell on the battlefield; and the other Rājputs fled. When Ayāz Sultānī came to know of these happenings, he advanced with his army fully equipped to reinforce and help Şafdar Khān. When he reached the battlefield, he was amazed at the (gallant) efforts of Şafdar Khān; and applied the ointment of kindness on the wounds of the ghāzis (victorious heroes of Islām).

On the following morning, Malik Qawām-ul-mulk Sultānī penetrated into the hill of Bānswāla in pursuit of the men (*i.e.*, those who had fled); and did not leave a vestige of men and habitation there. Ugar Sēn, wounded as he was, went to the Rānā, and told him all that had happened. When Malik Ayāz arrived at Mandisōr, and besieged it, Rānā Sānkā came to the aid of his *thānadār*; and halting at a distance of twelve *karōhs* from Mandisōr sent <sup>3</sup> the following

<sup>1</sup> One MS. calls him *ملك شيخ اشجع الملك* but the other and the lith. ed. omit *شيخ*. Firishtah calls him Malik Ashja'-ul-mulk, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 91), apparently following the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, calls him Shooja-ool-Moolk. Bayley, of course, calls him Shujā'-ul-Mulk.

<sup>2</sup> The name of the place is *مال* Mal, and *نال* Nal in the MSS. and *پال* Pal in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is *مال* Mal; but Col. Briggs calls the Rāja the Ray of Poloh. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* does not give the name of the Rāja, but calls him the Rūjah of Bānsbālah. Firishtah's account of the information of the intended night attack, and the skirmish with the men who were in ambush, agrees word for word with the text. The account in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* is somewhat different. Ugar Sēn is not named, but is probably included in "some relatives of Mēdini Rāo". It is also said that the Musulmāns were greatly outnumbered, but they fought bravely and defeated the Rājputs (Bayley, p. 272).

<sup>3</sup> The lith. ed. of Firishtah gives the same version of the message as the text; but Col. Briggs says that "there were certain conditions so extravagant, that Mullik Einz determined to continue the siege". The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*,

message to Malik Ayāz, "I am sending ambassadors to wait on the Sultān; and I shall be enlisted among his adherents. Do you abandon the siege." Malik Ayāz made some polite speeches, which had really no meaning, to the messengers; and devoted all his energy to the capture of the fort; and carried the mines so far, that it became a matter of to-day or to-morrow.

At this time <sup>1</sup> Sharzah Khān Sharwānī came from Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji, and delivered a message to Malik Ayāz, to the effect, that if there was any necessity for help and reinforcement, he would at once come to render it. Malik Ayāz was delighted, and asked him to come. As Sultān Maḥmūd was bound by ties of gratitude to Muẓaffar Shāh, he came to Māndisōr bringing <sup>2</sup> Silāhadī Pūrabia with him. Rānā Sānkā was frightened at the coming of Sultān Maḥmūd; and sent Mēdinī Rāy to Silāhadī with the following message, "It is right that one should favour one's own community. It is right, therefore, that he should not hold himself excused from rendering his duty to his community; and at present <sup>3</sup> he should exert himself in bringing about a treaty of peace".

After some days things came to such a pass, that the garrison was reduced to the greatest straits. Qawām-ul-mulk advanced his battery

Bayley, page 273, gives the terms of the message in some detail, but I do not find anything extravagant in them.

<sup>1</sup> The name is mentioned only in the Ṭabaqāt and in Firishtah. It is Sharzah in the MS. of the Ṭabaqāt, and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt it is Shēr. The MS. of the Ṭabaqāt has Sarwānī, but the lith. eds. of both the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah have Sharwānī.

<sup>2</sup> The name of Silāhadī is written as سلاهدي in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt, but in the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is سلاهدي. In the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 273, he is called "Silahdi, a Tuar Rājput by tribe", but Bayley says in a note that the description of Silahadi's tribe is only in MS. A, and there also doubtful. On an earlier page, I ventured a guess in respect of another Silāhadī that the name might be a corruption of Salya Devā but it occurs to me now that it is more probably a corruption of Silādri, the rocky mountain.

The Mirāt-i-Sikandari tells a different story about Silāhadī. It says he was coming from Rāisīn with one hundred thousand horse to have an interview with Malik Aīāz, but Mēdinī Rāy went and met him on the way, and enticed him over to the Rānā.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah adds سلاهدي هرچند سعی کرد صلح نشد, i.e., although Silhadī made (every) effort, peace could not be effected.



and wanted to get into the fort. Malik Ayāz, fearing that the victory might be attributed to Qawām-ul-mulk, kept him back that day from engaging the enemy. The *amīrs* of Gujrāt, hearing of this intention, were grieved in their hearts against Malik Ayāz. Mubāriz-ul-mulk and some other commanders advanced the next morning to fight with Rānā Sānkā's troops, without taking his permission. Malik Tughlaq Shāh Fūlādī went and brought them back from the way. There was now a discussion among the *amīrs*; but for fear of the punishment by the Sultān, they could not advance again without the permission of Malik Ayāz. The latter, in spite of the opposition of the *amīrs*, made his soldiers ready, and set fire to the mines. When the bastion was shattered and fell down, it was found, that the Rājput̃s having become aware of the state of things, had built another wall opposite to the bastion.

The next day emissaries came from Rānā Sānkā, and said, "The Rāuā says that the slave (*i.e.*, he himself) wants to become enlisted among the loyal adherents (of the Sultān), and <sup>1</sup> to send back the elephants which he had seized in the invasion of Aḥmadnagar, with his son, for the service of the Sultān. He did not know what was the reason of all this unkindness and harshness on their part". Malik Ayāz, owing to the opposition of Malik Qawām-ul-mulk, gave his consent to the proposed peace and began to settle the terms. The other *amīrs* refused their consent; and waited upon Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī, and inviting him to carry on the war, determined that they should begin the battle on the following Wednesday. A man who was present at the assembly waited on Malik Ayāz, and informed him of all that has passed. Malik Ayāz sent a man that very moment to wait on Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī; and represented to him that His Majesty the Sultān had entrusted the reins of controlling the army in his hands, so that he may carry into effect everything in which he saw its welfare; and now that he (*i.e.*, Sultān Maḥmūd) at the instigation and incitement of the *amīrs* of Gujrāt wanted to carry on the war, this slave could not agree to that, for there was a great probability, that on account of the ill-luck, which always attends on perversity and dissension. the hand of hope will not reach the skirts of our object.

---

<sup>1</sup> This was one of the terms of the previous message of Rānā Sānkā given in the *Mīrāt-i-Sikandarī* (see note 3, page 314).

On the morning of Wednesday, which had been selected for the battle, Malik Ayūz moved his camp; and encamped at Khaljipūr; and after bestowing robes of honour on the emissaries of Rānā Sānkā, <sup>1</sup> gave them leave to go back. Sultān Mahmūd Khalji also marched away in the direction of Mandū. When Malik Ayūz had the honour of waiting on the Sultān at Chāmpānūr, <sup>2</sup> he reproved and reprimanded him; and gave him permission to go to the port of Dīp, so that after equipping his retainers, he might return, and wait on the Sultān after the rains. It was also settled that after the end of the rains, the Sultān in his own august person, should proceed to chastise the <sup>3</sup> Rānā.

Malik Ayūz sent one of his trustworthy men to Rānā Sānkā and gave him this message, "As friendship has grown up between us, it is proper that we should both do everything that may be beneficial and advantageous to each other; and as on account of the return of the *amīrs* from that country, the noble heart of the Sultān has become heavy; and he wishes that the shadow of his conquest should be cast over that country, and he should punish the insurgents. This will cause much evil to that country. It is right and proper, that he should send his son on the wings of peace with tribute and much beautiful presents, so that the inhabitants of that country might be preserved from the assaults of the Sultān's wrath." Sultān Muzaḥḥar came from Chāmpānūr to Aḥmadābād in the month of Muḥarram of 928 A.H., (December, 1521 A.D.), so that he might advance towards Chitōr, after making the necessary preparations. In the

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah agrees with the text, but the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* and the Cambridge History of India say that Malik Ayūz concluded peace with Rānā Sānkā. He could not have done so without the Sultān's express order; and it appears from what happened later that the Sultān intended to carry on the war. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 93) says, "A suspension of hostilities was accordingly agreed on, until communications could be received from the king." But this is not mentioned by Firishtah.

<sup>2</sup> The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 275, says that in consequence of his displeasure, the Sultān did not give Malik Ayūz the usual robe of honour at his departure.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has Sānkā after Rānā, but the other MSS. and the lith. ed. do not have it.

<sup>4</sup> The year is 1522 A.D. in the Cambridge History of India, page 321; and 929 A.H., 1523 A.D. in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 275.

course of some days he collected and equipped an army at Aḥmadābād, and encamped at the reservoir of Kānkria; and there was a <sup>1</sup> delay of three days at this place for the mustering of the troops. At this time news came that Rānā Sānkā had sent his son with much tribute to wait on the Sultān; and the son had arrived at the town of Mahrāsa. After a few days, when he waited on the Sultān, and presented the beautiful things (which he had brought), the Sultān forgave his father's offences, and presented to him a princely robe of honour; and having <sup>2</sup> cancelled the mustering of the army, he spent some days in the neighbourhood of Jhālāwār in seeing the country and hunting; and then went to Aḥmadābād. There he again <sup>3</sup> bestowed a robe of honour on the son of the Rānā, and bade him farewell. After that he himself went to <sup>4</sup> Kaparbhanj.

In this year Malik Aḡāz, who was a support of the empire, bound up the goods of existence (*i.e.*, died). Sultān Muẓaffar was <sup>5</sup> pained and grieved on hearing this news; and conferred his *jāgīr* on his <sup>6</sup> eldest son.

In the year <sup>7</sup> 930 A.H., 1524 A.D. (the Sultān) rode out from Chāmpānīr, in order to chastise some rebels and refractory persons;

<sup>1</sup> The word توقف delay, is to be found in only one of the MSS., but is not in the other or in the lith. ed. I have, however, inserted it as it appears to be required.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. have فتح ان لشکر نمود. This is so clearly a mistake that I have had no hesitation in substituting نسخ for فتح. I find the lith. ed. of Firishtah has the correct word. The text-edition has the reading in the MSS.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has لطف عطا نمود instead of لطف نمود.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. says he went to Sarkhēj; but no other historian mentions either Kaparbhanj or Sarkhēj. سرکيج in the text-edition.

<sup>5</sup> Firishtah also says so, but the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 275, says, "When the Sultan heard of Malik Aīāz's death, he said, 'The life of Malik Aīāz has come to its close. It would have been better, if he had been killed fighting against the Rānā, for then he would have been a martyr'."

<sup>6</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt have پسر بزرگ but Firishtah lith. ed. omits بزرگ. Col. Briggs also has "some" without any qualifying adjective; but the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī has "to his eldest son Ishāk".

<sup>7</sup> Firishtah agrees almost word for word, but Col. Briggs changes the year to 929 A.H., and says, he marched to Champanere and "caused the town of

and halted for some days between the towns of Mahrāsa and Harsōl. He entirely rebuilt the fort of Mahrāsa and then returned towards Aḥmadābād. On the way <sup>1</sup> he heard that the member of the harem (of the Sultān), who was most beloved of him, had died. The Sultān and the Shāhzāda grieved sorely; and they went to her grave, and performed the mourning rites. After the termination of the period of mourning, they came to Aḥmadābād, with sorrow-stricken hearts and grief-laden minds. <sup>2</sup> The Sultān passed most of his time in indulging in his grief. One day, Khudāwand Khān, who was distinguished among the *amīrs* and the *vazīrs* for his intellect and wisdom, waited on the Sultān and represented in clear language the advantage and benefit of patience, and freed him from grief and pain. As the rainy season had commenced, he induced the Sultān to take a trip to Chāmpānīr. The Sultān remembered the breezes of Chāmpānīr and went there.

One day Ālam Khān, son of Sultān Sikandar Lūdī Bādshāh of Dehli represented to the Sultān, that <sup>3</sup> "Sultān Ibrāhīm, son of Sultān Sikandar, had, owing to his inexperience, drawn his blood-drinking sword out of the scabbard; and had put the great *amīrs* to death; and those who had escaped the sword had sent repeated letters and petitions, and had asked this slave (*i.e.*, himself) to come. As this *faqīr* had

---

Mahrāsa to be repaired". The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 276, agrees generally with the text. The Cambridge History of India does not mention these matters at all.

<sup>1</sup> Firishah copies the *Ṭabaqāt* almost *verbatim*. Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India do not mention the death. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 276, says, "On the way his chief wife, Bibi Rūnī, mother of prince Sikandar Khān died"; which would imply that she was travelling with the Sultān. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* praises her right judgment, her great influence in the affairs of the kingdom, her motherly care of high and low, and the singular firmness of her judgments.

<sup>2</sup> The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* says, he fell ill, and after his recovery went to Chāmpānīr, or as Bayley calls the place Muḥamadābād. It does not mention Khudāwand Khān's advice and admonition.

<sup>3</sup> This long-winded and highly metaphorical request is copied by Firishah. Ālam Khān was a son of Bahlūl Lūdī and not of Sikandar Lūdī, as stated in the text, and he was therefore an uncle of Ibrāhīm. As stated in the text his later career is narrated in the section about Dehli. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 95) calls him Jalal Khan.

attended on Your Majesty for a long time in the hope that by the advantage of the attention of this great family he would arrive at greatness; now that time has come, that the star of his good fortune would ascend from the *nādir* of defeat, and the image of hope should shine in the mirror of success, he hopes that the wing of (the Sultān's) generosity and the shadow of his kindness, should be spread over the head of this *faqīr*, so that his ancestral dominion should come into his possession". Sultān Muẓaffar sent him back with a detachment of troops and gave him some money. He advanced towards Dehlī to fight with Sultān Ibrāhīm. A full account of his adventures has been given in the section about Dehlī.

In the year 931 A.H. <sup>1</sup>(1524 A.D.) the Sultān went through Chāmpānīr to Īdar. On the way Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān complained about his meagre income, and his large expenses, and prayed that his allowance may be made equal to that of Shāhzāda Sikandar Khān. The Sultān delayed in fulfilling his expectations on account of certain objections, and made a promise for a future consideration. Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān was pained and discouraged at this, and went away to Aḥmadābād without obtaining the Sultān's leave. He went from there to the country of <sup>2</sup>Māl. The Raja of Māl whose name was

---

<sup>1</sup> Bayley (p. 277) gives 1525 as the corresponding year of the Christian era, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 96) has 1524, and the Cambridge History of India, page 321, has, "late in 1524".

<sup>2</sup> As regards Māl see note 2, page 314. M. Hidayat Ḥosain in the text-edition has مال for ماله. Firishtah lith. ed. does not here give the name of the Rāja, but calls him the Rāja of Māl, but the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī gives the name as Rāwal Udi Singh (as Bayley transliterates it) and describes him as Rājah of Dūngarpūr. Bayley, however, says in a note that the Tabakāt "calls him the Rājah of Pāl"; and goes on to say that "Pāl seems to have been used in those days, as a kind of general name given to a congeries of petty hill states, of which the rulers were Hindūs and probably all or nearly all Rajpūts. They seem to have included Dūngarpūr, Bijanagar, Bānsbālah and others" (Bayley, page 277). Col. Briggs calls the Raja Oody Singh the Raja of Poloh, and the Cambridge History of India (p. 321), apparently following the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Udai Singh of Dūngarpur. The account of the travels of Bahādur Khān as given by Firishtah agrees almost word for word with that in the text and by Col. Briggs; the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī and the Cambridge History of India also agree generally, but the last two do not mention the pilgrimage to the tomb of the holy Khwājah at Ajmēr.

Udai Singh considered the arrival of the Shāhzāda a very great blessing; and rendered him services of various kinds. Then when the Shāhzāda went to the country of Chitōr, Rānā Sānkā came forward to welcome him; and presented him with articles of every kind as

---

but not in the lith. ed.; but I have inserted it.

The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* (Bayley, p. 278) gives a different version of this, according to which Itihādār Khān with some of his own men pursued a party of Moghals who were carrying off some of Sultān Ibrāhīm's men as prisoners, and on coming up with them, slew some of them, and returned with the men he had rescued.

<sup>4</sup> He is called Sultān in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishlah, in this place, though farther on, he is again called Shāhzāda.

this had treacherous thoughts in his mind; and Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān perceiving this started towards <sup>1</sup>Jaunpūr.

When the news that Bahādur Khān had gone to Dehlī, and Firdūs Makānī Bābar Bādshāh had arrived in those parts with the Maghūl army reached Sultān Muẓaffar, <sup>2</sup> he on account of the separation from his son became depressed and sorrowful; and ordered Khudāwand Khān to send letters and petitions to summon the Shāhzāda. At this time there was a great famine in Gujrāt, and the people suffered great distress. Sultān Muẓaffar, owing to the love which he had for the people, <sup>3</sup> began a complete recitation of the great book (*Qurān*) and of the six canonical books of Ḥadis (صحاح سنة). The great and Holy God taking account of the true and pious intention of the Sultān removed the calamity from his people. At the same time, the Sultān fell ill, and his illness increased from day to day. One day he in great sorrow spoke of Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān. Someone taking advantage of the opportunity informed him that the army was divided into <sup>4</sup> two factions. One of them wanted the succession

<sup>1</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 321, says that he possibly selected "this town in response to an invitation received from the local nobles, who are said to have offered him the throne". This is also stated in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 279; but it also appears from the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* that he was about to go to Jōnpūr, when he heard of the death of his father, and went off to Gujārāt.

<sup>2</sup> Bayley, page 279, says that Sultān Muẓaffar was exceedingly vexed on hearing that Bahādur Khān had gone to Dehli; and then says in a note that according to the *Tabakāt-i-Akbari*, "he distinctly stated, as his reason that he was afraid lest Bahādur Khān by fighting against the Moghals, might involve the country of Gujārāt in hostilities with the latter people". There is nothing like this in the *Ṭabaqāt* as far as I can see.

<sup>3</sup> I suppose, as a pious act, which would avert the calamity from his people. The actual words are شروع در ختم مصحف مجید و ختم صحاح سنة نمود. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*'s account is different. It says, on the authority of the *Tārīkh-i-Bahādar Shāhi*, that Sultān Muẓaffar lifted up his hands in prayer to God, and said, "Oh Lord, if for any fault of mine my people are afflicted, take me from this world, and leave my people unharmed, and relieve them from this drought". This reminds one of Bābar's act of devoting himself for affecting the recovery of Humāyūn from his illness. But in this case Sultān Muẓaffar offered himself up, not for the sake of his dear son, but for relieving the distress of his subjects.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. inserts اند after شد.

of Shāhzāda Sikandar Khān; while the other was inclined towards Latif Khān. Sultān Muẓaffar on hearing this said, "Has any news come from Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān?" Intelligent and wise men have inferred from this that he wished to make Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān his heir. He then called Sikandar Khān to his presence, and gave him some advice in the matter of his brothers and then gave him leave to retire. <sup>1</sup> Then he went to the *ḥaram serā*, and again came back outside, and rested for a moment. After a moment he heard the call of Friday prayer. He said, "I do not find the strength in me to go to the *masjid*". He sent the men who were there to the mosque, and said the midday prayer. After he had finished he rested for a moment; and then passed away into the mercy of God. The period of his reign was fourteen years and nine months.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN SIKANDAR, SON OF SULTĀN MUẒAFFAR SHĀH.

As the inevitable happened to Sultān Muẓaffar, Shāhzāda Sikandar Khān, by the exertions of 'Imād-ud-mulk Sultānī and Khudāwand Khān and Fath Khān, son of Fath Khān, sat on the throne of the empire. He sent the body of his father to the town of Sarkhēj, and performed the rites of mourning.

<sup>1</sup> This is a very simple, and as it appears to me, a very graphic and impressive word-picture of the passing away of a good man. Firishtah as usual copies the sentences almost word for word, but he adds the day and date, which were Friday the 2nd Jamūdi-ul-āwwal, 932 A.H. Firishtah also says that he died in his forty second year, and was a pious Musalmān and a good calligraphist. That he always copied the *Qurān*, and as the copies were finished sent them to the two sacred places. That many great men from 'Irān, Tūrān, Rūm and 'Arabistān came to Gujrāt in his reign, but he gives the name of only one, namely, Mullā Maḥmūd Siāwash, who was a great calligraphist and came from Shīrāz. Col. Briggs gives the 3rd Jumad-ool-Awul, 932. 17th February, 1525, as the date of his death, and says he died in his 56th year (vol. IV, p. 97).

The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* describes the death scene at somewhat greater length, Bayley, page 281; and it also describes his character, giving many anecdotes, extending over many pages. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* says, Bayley, page 281, that Sultān Muẓaffar died on the 2nd Jūmādi-ul-ākhir, 932 A.H. (1526 A.D.); but places the accession of Sultān Sikandar (page 307) on the 22nd Jūmādi-ul-ākhir, 932 A.H., 7th April, 1526. The *Cambridge History of India* (p. 322) has the 7th April, 1526, as the date of Sultān Muẓaffar's death.



On the 3rd day, <sup>1</sup> at the end of those rites, he proceeded to Chāmpānīr. When he arrived in the town of <sup>2</sup> Batūh, he <sup>3</sup> went on a pilgrimage to the tombs of the holy men of the place. He heard that <sup>4</sup> Shāh Shaikh Jīū, who was one of the descendants of Quṭb 'Alam Shaikh Burhān-ud-dīn, had said, that the kingdom would pass to Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān; he attributed false speaking to Shāh Shaikh Jīū; and spoke unseemly words about him. When he arrived at Chāmpānīr, he showed favour <sup>5</sup> to his own servants, and conferred fiefs on them; and did not show any kindness whatever to the *amirs* of his father and grandfather. Owing to this reason all the *amirs* <sup>6</sup> were sick at heart, and thoroughly vexed, and waited for what might appear from the womb of divine providence. <sup>7</sup> Sīmā 'Imād-ul-mulk Sultānī, who was one of the Muẓaffar Shāhī slaves, and the slave of the mother of Sikandar Shāh, was very much aggrieved in his heart.

<sup>1</sup> The text in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. is as I have got it; but Firishtah lith. ed. has روز سیوم ار تعزیت برخاسته. This makes better sense. Firishtah begins the account of the reign by saying that there were two factions, the larger one in favour of Sikandar Khān, and the smaller in that of Latif Khān; but as Sultān Muẓaffar had appointed Sultān Sikandar to be his heir, the great nobles took his side; and Latif Khān being unable to assert his claim went away to his fief of Sultānpūr and Nadarbār.

<sup>2</sup> ستوة and بتوة in MSS. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted the former in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah agrees; but the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 307, says that "he went away without caring to visit the tombs of the holy men at Batūh".

<sup>4</sup> The name is شیخ جو and شیخ جون in the MSS., and شیخ صبور in two places in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is شیخ چنور; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 98) has Shāh Sheikhjee. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 307, has Shēkh Jīū.

<sup>5</sup> Firishtah explains که نوکران ایام شاعر ادگی بودند, i.e., who were his servants, during the time when he was a Shāhzāda.

<sup>6</sup> The word گشته, which I have inserted in the text, is in one MS.; but not in the other MS. or in the lith. ed.

<sup>7</sup> The prefix سیمā occurs in both MSS., but not in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. calls him 'Imād-ul-mulk Hābslā; and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 308, calls him, "'Imād-ul-mulk Khush-kadam, who was a king in his own way". The meaning of the last clause is not clear. The Cambridge History of India, page 322, calls him "Imād-ul-Mulk Khush Qadam".



The people of Gujrāt, considering this defeat to mean an omen of the downfall of Sultān Sikandar, awaited further results. Sultān Sikandar appointed <sup>1</sup> Qaisar Khūn with a large army for the punishment of those wretched people.

While these things were happening, some of the Muzaffarī *amīrs*, who were noted for their wickedness, said to 'Imād-ul-mulk, "Sultān Sikandar wants to put you to death; as there are relations of sincere attachments between you and us, we have informed you". As 'Imād-ul-mulk made himself <sup>2</sup> intoxicated with what those men of evil destiny told him, (he determined) that by any means that might be possible he would remove Sultān Sikandar from the way; and would raise one of the <sup>3</sup> infant sons of Muzaffar Shāh on the throne; and himself carry on the political and revenue administration of the country. One day Sikandar rode out on his horse. 'Imād-ul-mulk completely armed his retainers and followed him with the intention of murdering him; but found no opportunity. On the way, some persons disclosed the state of things to Sultān Sikandar; but he, in his simple-mindedness, said in reply, "The people want that I should harass the *amīrs*, and particularly the slaves of Muzaffar Shāh. 'Imād-ul-mulk is one of our hereditary slaves. How should he attempt such a wicked act?" In spite of what he said, however, he became grieved and pained at what he had heard. He told one of his intimates and confidants, that it is repeated among the common people from time to time that Bahūdūr Shāh is coming from Dehlī to conquer Gujrāt; this becomes the cause of worry to their minds.

It so happened, that on that very night, he saw in a <sup>4</sup> dream His Holiness the leader of the wayfarers in the path of the faith, Saiyid

<sup>1</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 322, says that the choice of Qaisar Khūn shows "either ignorance and folly of the king, or the treachery of the nobles, for Qaisar Khūn was Latif's principal adherent". This may be correct, but I have not seen anything anywhere in support of this statement.

<sup>2</sup> The word is مضر in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah who, as usual, copies a great deal from the Tabaqāt has the word مقرر here instead of مضر.

<sup>3</sup> The word is اطفال, minor sons, and as a matter of fact only Naṣr Khūn.

<sup>4</sup> In the account of the dream in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 308), Shāh 'Alam and Shāh Jū are the only two mentioned; and Sultān Muzaffar is

Jalāl Bukhārī and Shāh ‘Ālām and a number of other Shaikhs. Sultān Muẓaffar was also in attendance on them. Sultān Muẓaffar was saying, “Son Sikandar rise from the throne”. Shaikh Jīū was also saying, “Rise. It is not your place. Bahādur Shāh is the heir to the throne”. When he awoke Sultān Sikandar immediately sent for a man, and repeated to him what he had seen in the dream. He became very agitated on account of the dream; and in order to keep his mind occupied, mounted to go and play *chaugān*. The fact of the dream became known to some people. After a *pās* or *pahar*, he went to the palace, and had some food, and went to rest. As the *amīrs*, and the Sultān’s particular attendants went to their houses, ‘Imād-ul-mulk with some of the men of that group (*i.e.*, those who had told him that the Sultān wanted to put him to death) and two of Sultān Muẓaffar’s slaves and another *Ḥabshī* slave went to the palace. This was on the 19th Sha‘ban 932 A.H. (May 30th, O.S. and April 12th N.S., A.D. 1526).

‘Imād-ul-mulk <sup>1</sup> said to the men, who were with him, “Look at this palace, for it is one of the <sup>2</sup> wonders of the age”. When they arrived on the bank of the reservoir, they met Naṣrat-ul-mulk and Ibrāhīm, son of Janhar, who were there. They at once drew their swords from the scabbards and rushed towards them. Naṣrat-ul-mulk and Ibrāhīm also placed their hands on their swords; but the wounds inflicted by them were of no avail, and they were both slain. From that place the assassins went to Sultān Sikandar’s bed-chamber. Saiyid ‘Imād-din was seated before the bed, and was keeping

---

said to have declared, “Surely it is not fated that Sikandar Khān should descend from the throne;” but Shēkh Jīū said, “Yes, it is even so”.

<sup>1</sup> The story has a flavour of unreality. The men had surely seen the palace before; but Firishtah says the same thing, and he agrees generally as to the incidents of the day on which Sultān Sikandar was murdered. Col. Briggs (vol. IV. p. 100) gives the name of Baha-ool-Moolk, Dar-ool-Moolk and Seif Khan, as the men who accompanied Imad-ool-Moolk, besides the two Turkish slaves and one Abyssinian; and he says that Sikandar Shah, awakened by the noise rushed out to ascertain its cause, when the assassins put him to death. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* (Bayley, p. 311) has a somewhat different account, but I need not repeat it here. According to it the Sultān was actually murdered by one Bahādur, or Bahādar as Bayley transliterates the name.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. inserts عجايب after غرائب.

guard. When suddenly these men rushed in, the Saiyid on seeing what was happening, became agitated, but placed his hand on his sword and wounded two men; but he himself became a martyr. The assassins then inflicted two or three wounds on Sulṭān Sikandar, while he was still on the bed. The Sulṭān, the victim of these attacks, in great fear and alarm jumped up from the bed and stood on the ground, when one of them smote him with the sword of <sup>1</sup> cruelty, and made a martyr of him. His rule lasted for <sup>2</sup> two months and sixteen days.

<sup>3</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF NAṢIR KHĀN ENTITLED SULṬĀN MAḤMŪD, SON OF SULṬĀN MUẒAFFAR.

As Sulṭān Sikandar became a martyr, 'Imād-ul-mulk in concert with Bahā'-ul-mulk forthwith brought Naṣir Khān out of the harem, and placing him on the throne gave him the title of Sulṭān Maḥmūd. The *amīrs* of Sulṭān Sikandar fled (on account of their suspicions and fears) in different directions; and their houses were plundered and sacked. The martyr Sulṭān's body was sent to *mandā'* Jalōl, one of the dependencies of Chāmpūnār, and was deposited in the earth. The *amīrs* and the chief men of Gujrāt had to come out of necessity to offer their congratulations. 'Imād-ul-mulk in accordance with the customary law gave royal robes of honour to the *amīrs* and the great men, and comforted them, and also conferred titles.

<sup>1</sup> The words appear to be شمشیر سیخکی and سیخکی in the MS. The second word appears to be سختگی, hardship or cruelty.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. have two months and sixteen days. The lith. ed. has ten months. Firishtah lith. ed. does not mention the period, but Col. Briggs has three months and seventeen days, from Jumād-ul-Awwal 3rd to Shubān 10th. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 317) makes it only one month and sixteen days from the 28th Jamādī-ul-ākhir to Sha'bān 14th; but Bayley says in a note that some MSS. and the Tārīkh-i-Alfi make it two months and sixteen days, but it appears that, according to the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī itself, Bayley, page 281, Sulṭān MuẒaffar died on the 2nd and not on the 28th Jamādī-ul-ākhir, and that Sulṭān Sikandar was assassinated on the 10th Sha'bān; two months and sixteen days was the correct period.

<sup>3</sup> The heading I adopted is that in both the MSS. In the lith. ed. it is ذکر سلطنت سلطان محمود المصطفی سلطان محمود ظفر, which is quite incorrect.

were conferred on one hundred and eighty-one persons, but the stipends and emoluments of the *amīrs* were not increased. Most people waited for the arrival of Sultān Bahādur; and made every effort by sending messages and emissaries to summon him. They were angry at the leadership and eminence of 'Imād-ul-mulk, who had been one of the Sultān's slaves, and <sup>1</sup> did not lower their heads in obedience and submission to him. Khndāwand Khān and Tāj Khān more specially sought to be ahead of the others in this matter. 'Imād-ul-mulk, on account of his ancient and recent enmity, attempted to injure them. Tāj Khān, having put the girdle of endeavour and energy on his loins, advanced with a well-equipped army, drawn from his own caste and tribesmen, to bring back Sultān Bahādur. 'Imād-ul-mulk in great distress wrote a letter to <sup>2</sup> Nizām-ul-mulk Dakinī, sent him much money and summoned him to come to the boundary of Sultānpūr and Nadarbār. He also wrote a letter to the <sup>3</sup> Rāja of Māl, and summoned him to the border of Chāmpānīr; and the Rāja, on account of his being in the vicinity, collected his forces, and came to the neighbourhood of Chāmpānīr. ('Imād-ul-mulk also) owing to his great caution and far-sightedness sent a petition to His Majesty Firdūs Mukānī <sup>4</sup> Bābar Bādshāh, to the effect that if he would send one of his many powerful armies, he would present the

<sup>1</sup> The whole of the sentence from *اوردند* to *وازی سری* is omitted from one of the MSS. It is also omitted in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah says that Nizām-ul-mulk kept the *تحایف*, but passed the time with negligence. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 101, 102) has presents consisting of jewels and money. Contrary to what is stated in the text and in Firishtah, the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 318, says that, 'Imād-ul-Mulk wrote to 'Imād-ul-Mulk Ilchpūri to come to Sultānpūr and Nadarbār, and wrote to Rānā Sānkā, and conciliated the neighbouring *zamīndārs*, and also wrote to Bābar.

<sup>3</sup> See note 2, page 314.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. has Humāyūn Bādshāh here by mistake; but a few lines farther down it has Bābar Bādshāh. Firishtah's account of the petition to Bābar agrees generally with the text, but he says that 'Imād-ul-mulk suggested that if one of Bābar's army would come to Dīp, he ('Imād-ul-mulk) would present a *krōr* of *tankas* towards the expenses. Col. Briggs explains this by saying that it was intended that Babur should send the force down the Indus to land at Dīū, and he adds that the letter to Babur never reached its destination, having been intercepted by the ruler of Dongurpoor (vol. IV, p. 102).

fort of Dip, and one *krōr* of *tankas* in cash towards the expenses of His Majesty's servants.

The *thānadār* of Dūngarpūr, having received information that 'Imād-ul-mulk had sent a petition to Bābar Bādshāh, and had asked His Majesty to come to Gujrāt, sent a letter to Tāj Khān and Khudāwand Khān: and the *amīrs* of Gujrāt sent a man to Bahādur Shāh and summoned him. <sup>1</sup> The messenger sent by the *amīrs* waited upon Sultān Bahādur in the neighbourhood: and presented to him their petition. Sultān Bahādur was sad and grieved at his father's death, and performed the mourning ceremony. He gave Pāyinda Khān Afghān, who had come from Jaunpūr to take him there, permission to go back; and although the latter dilated (on the splendour) of the empire of the eastern country, and incited him to go there, he turned his face towards Aḥmadābād. They say, that men came at one and the same time from Jaunpūr and Gujrāt to summon him. He said, he would leave the choice to his horse, in whichever direction he would take him. The horse started towards Gujrāt. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Chitōr, soldiers arrived one after another from Gujrāt; and they brought the news of the assassination of Sultān Sikandar, and the accession of Naṣir Khān. Sultān Bahādur was pained to hear of it, and starting from there encamped at Chitōr. There Chānd Khān and Ibrāhīm Khān, sons of Sultān Muẓaffar, came to him. He was pleased and delighted at meeting his brothers. Chānd Khān took leave of him and remained at Chitōr; but Ibrāhīm Khān chose the service of his brother, and accompanied him. In a short time after passing Chitōr, <sup>2</sup> Udai Singh, Rāja of Māl, and some adherents

---

<sup>1</sup> The account in *Firishtah* agrees generally with that in the text, only he calls Pāyinda Khān Afghān Pābind Khān, and says he came from the Afghāns of Jaunpūr. He is also clearer about Bahādur's leaving the choice between Gujrāt and Jaunpūr to his horse. According to him Bahādur said, he would ride out, and then let go the reins. As to Chānd Khān and Ibrāhīm Khān, he says they were with Rānā Sānkā, being probably fugitives from Gujrāt. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 102) says that Chand Khan and Ibrahim Khan first gave Bahadur the news of the assassination of Sultan Sikundur, and he also says clearly that they had fled to the Rana after that event.

<sup>2</sup> *Firishtah* lith. ed. here calls Udai Singh, Rāja of Mālpūr, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 102) has Raja Oody Sing of Poloh as before.

of Sikandar, such as Malik Sarwar and Malik Yūsuf and Latif and others, came and entered Sultān Bahādur's service.

Sultān Bahādur sent Malik Tāj Khān with a *farman* conveying assurances of his favour to Tāj Khān and the other *amīrs*; and gave them news of his <sup>1</sup> approach. Tāj Khān on seeing the letter advanced from Dandūga with a great force to join the service of Sultān Bahādur; and <sup>2</sup> he bade farewell to Latif Khān, son of Muẓaffar, after giving him a sum of money to pay his expenses; (telling him) now that the heir of Muẓaffar's and Maḥmūd's kingdom had arrived, it was not advisable that he should remain there. Latif Khān with a heart which was frying, and with eyes which were shedding tears went as a suppliant to Faṭḥ Khān who was a cousin (uncle's son) of Sultān Bahādur. When the Sultān arrived at Dāngarpūr, Khurram Khān and other Khāns hastened to welcome him; and the *amīrs* and *sardārs* of all the provinces turned their faces towards him. 'Imād-ul-mulk on hearing this news, and being deserted by these adherents began to collect troops. He began to empty the treasury, and sent a number of men with an army ready to fight and fifty elephants, under the command of 'Aḍḍ-ul-mulk to the town of Mahrāsa; so that they might on their arrival there, close the roads to the coming and going of the people, and <sup>3</sup> permit no one to go to Sultān Bahādur. When Sultān Bahādur arrived in the town of Maḥmūdābād, the *amīrs* who had joined Sikandar, and who had fled for fear of their lives, came and obtained the honour of the service (of Sultān Bahādur). The men who were with 'Aḍḍ-ul-mulk fled from Mahrāsa. On the following morning when

<sup>1</sup> The word خود is omitted in one MS.

<sup>2</sup> It would appear that Shūhzāda Latif Khān was with Tāj Khān, and this is stated expressly by Firishtah, as he says که باور. Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 326, says that when Bahādur came to Dāngarpūr, Tāj Khān left Dhandūkāl to wait upon him. Just then prince Latif Khān arrived at Dhandūkāl, and solicited the help of Tāj Khān, offering to place the administration of the country to his hands. Tāj Khān told him that he had already promised his support to Sultān Bahādur.

<sup>3</sup> There is a difference in the readings here. One MS. has که کسی پیش سلطان بهادر. The other omits the word Sultān. The lith. ed. has که کسی بهلازمت سلطان بهادر. I have adopted the first reading, which is also the reading in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but he substitutes Shūhzāda for Sultān.



the Sultān arrived at Mahrāsa, Tāj Khān, with the royal umbrella and the other insignia of royalty, came and saw the Sultān; and the latter with great pomp and power encamped in the city of Nahrwāla<sup>1</sup> Pattan on the 26th of the auspicious month of Ramaḍān in the year 932 A.H., August 15th X.S., 1526 A.D. From that place he advanced towards Ahmadābād after<sup>2</sup> assuming the insignia of royalty. On the 22nd of the month, he performed the pilgrimage to the tombs of the great Shaikhs and his royal ancestors; and then entered Ahmadābād.

‘Imād-ul-mulk in his agitation and confusion paid a<sup>3</sup> year’s wages to the soldiers in advance, and incited them to fight. <sup>4</sup> Sultān Bahādur had after three or four days left Ahmadābād with great pomp and splendour. During this interval most of the *amīrs*, after taking much money from ‘Imād-ul-mulk, joined the Sultān. <sup>5</sup> Bahā-ul-mulk and Dāwar-ul-mulk who were the actual murderers of Sultān Sikandar sought for a disagreement with ‘Imād-ul-mulk, and joined the Sultān’s service. The latter, considering it desirable in the cir-

<sup>1</sup> The word پٹن Pattan is left out in one MS.

<sup>2</sup> The word is اعلمى in both MSS., اعلم in the lith. ed., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. The 26th of Ramaḍān 932 A.H. corresponds to August 3rd, 1526 A.D., according to Col. Briggs and August (without any date) 1526 A.D. according to Bayley. Col. Briggs’s date is according to the old style. The date of the assumption of the royalty would accordingly be 15th of August (X.S.), 1526 A.D., and the place Nahrwāla. The Cambridge History of India, page 323, gives the 11th July, 1526, and Ahmadābād as the date and place respectively of the accession.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has زر يكال, the other has only يكال. The lith. ed. has مواجب يكال. Firishtah also has مواجب يكال. I have, therefore, retained the reading in the lith. ed. Firishtah adds that ‘Imād-ul-mulk also sent an emissary to Shāhrāda Latif Khān, so that he might with the latter’s aid be able to fight with Sultān Bahādur.

<sup>4</sup> This sentence is not in the lith. ed. but is in both MSS. There is, however, a slight difference between the two readings. One MS. has باحمد اباد while the other has از احمد اباد. I think the latter is correct. It appears from Firishtah that he went from Ahmadābād to Muhammadābād; and بر آمد means leaving and not entering.

<sup>5</sup> Baha-ool-Moolk and Dar-ool-Moolk were mentioned by Col. Briggs as two of the men who attacked and killed Sikandar Shah. See note 1, page 327.

circumstances of the time, tried to please them, and endeavoured to comfort (their?) hearts. The period of the rule of Sultān Maḥmūd Naṣir K̲h̲ān did not exceed four months.

<sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF THE ACCESSION OF SULTĀN BAḤĀDUR SHĀH.

As the day of <sup>2</sup> the 'Id-i-Ramaḍān of the year 932 A.H. was according to the selection of astrologers fixed as the time of the accession of Sultān Bahādur he sat on the throne of his great ancestors (on that day) by the exertions of the *amīrs* and the great men of the country, and raised the standard of empire. The rites of making offerings of loyalty, and of wave offering were carried out; and (the hearts) of the *amīrs* and of the great <sup>3</sup> men and of the commanders of the army were gladdened by increases in their stipends, and by addition to their titles, and by grants of money and horses and robes of honour.

In the beginning of Shawwāl he moved from that place, and advanced towards Chāmpānir. At the first stage of the journey Mu'azm K̲h̲ān with a number of other respected leaders hastened to wait on him, and received favours and kindness. When he started from that station, on the way he <sup>4</sup> conferred the title of Shams-ul-mulk on Nūḥ

<sup>1</sup> The heading I have in the text is the heading in both the MSS., with this difference that one has Shāh at the end, while the other omits it. The heading in the lith. ed. is ذکر سلطنته سلطان بہادر بن سلطان مظفر. This is more like the heading of other reigns.

<sup>2</sup> According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 327, Bahādur Shāh assumed the royal insignia at Nahrwālah on the 25th Ramazān, 932 A.H., August 1526; and the formal accession took place at Ahmadābād. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 103) says, he was formally crowned at Nehrwalla Puttun on the 26th Runzan, 932 A.H., August 3rd, 1526 A.H. The *Cambridge History of India*, page 323, says he ascended the throne on July the 11th, 1526, at Ahmadābād.

<sup>3</sup> The words اعیان are not to be found in one MS.

<sup>4</sup> There is a difference of readings here. One MS. has the reading I have accepted. The other MS. and the lith. ed. have نوح بن یوسف ملک و حسین بن سیف الملک را شمس الملک خطاب داد. Apparently there is some mistake, for one title could hardly be conferred on two persons. I have consulted *Firishtah* and the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, but have not received any help from either. There is no mention of the fact in either. *Firishtah* after mentioning the arrival of Munzaffar K̲h̲ān goes on to say that the river Bātrak was in such flood, etc. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 331, at once takes Sultān Bahādar to the

*bin* Yūsuf-ul-mulk; and when news came that the river of Bātrak was in such flood, that it was critical to cross it, Sultān Bahādur halted at the town of <sup>1</sup> Sahimj; and left Tāj Khān on the bank of the river, that he might send the army over in different bodies one after another. The next day a number of the *amīrs* of Chānpānīr, who had taken their <sup>2</sup> salaries from the treasury, came and joined him. Sultān Bahādur owing to the nobility of his spirit made a present of that <sup>3</sup> money to them. When Sultān Bahādur arrived at the bank of the river Mahindrī, at the fort of Khānpūr, his army commenced to cross over.

‘Imād-ul-mulk sent men towards Barōda and in other directions, so that they might raise the dust of rebellion and keep the Sultān occupied with it. But the latter rapidly crossed the river, and advanced towards Chāmpānīr. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the city, Dīū’-ul-mulk, son of Naṣīr Khān, <sup>4</sup> came and saw him. The

Mahindrī. Bayley in a note on that page says that the *Tahakāt-i-Akbari* is rather fuller at this place, and makes a quotation from it; but the grant of the title on Nāḥ *bin* Yūsuf-ul-mulk or on Ḥusain *bin* Saif-ul-mulk is not mentioned in it. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 105) does not mention the Bātrak, but says that Bahadur Shah was compelled to halt at the Sabarmutty on account of the heavy rain, from which one might infer that the Bātrak is probably another name of the Sabarmutty. Bayley in the quotation from the *Tahakāt* calls it the Wātrak.

<sup>1</sup> The name is written as سهونج in both MSS. and سيهونج in the lith. ed. and سونج in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*.

<sup>2</sup> The word is ماعينه in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It is مالها in the other MS. and also in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*. I have not before this seen the word ماعينه in respect of the stipends of *amīrs* and soldiers. The word ordinarily in use is علوفه. It is not clear in what way the *amīrs* had taken the *mahāna* or *māl*, but it may be inferred from what he says in the next sentence, that there was something reprehensible or wrong about it.

<sup>3</sup> The lith. ed. adds بر زبان نیاورد but neither the MSS. nor the corresponding sentence in *Firishtah* have those or any similar words.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. has آمده دید. The other has امر سلطان باو دید گفت. The word دید has evidently been misplaced from before سلطان to after باو, and آمد has been written امر. The lith. ed. has only آمد. The account given in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* (Bayley, p. 331) is different. It does not mention Dīū’-ul-mulk at all, but says the Sultān crossed the river with four hundred horsemen and some elephants, before the rest of the army; and sent Tāj Khān with three hundred

Sultān told him, "Go in advance, and convey this order to your father, that he should surround the house of 'Imād-ul-mulk and seize him". He also sent Tāj Khān very quickly with some other Khāns to attack 'Imād-ul-mulk; and he also himself mounted to follow him. Tāj Khān went with great quickness, and surrounded 'Imād-ul-mulk's house. The latter threw himself from the wall of the house, and took shelter in the house of Shāh Jīn Ṣadīqī. His house was pillaged and his sons taken prisoner. It so happened that Sultān Bahādur<sup>1</sup> crossed in front of the house of Khudāwand Khān. The latter came out of his house, and rendered homage. After that his slaves<sup>2</sup> seized 'Imād-ul-mulk, and brought him before the Sultān. The latter<sup>3</sup> ordered that 'Imād-ul-mulk and Ṣaif-ud-dīn and the other murderers of Sultān Sikandar should be hanged. The title of 'Imād-ul-mulk was conferred on Rafī'-ul-mulk, son of Malik Tuakil, who was one of the Muzaffār Shāhī slaves; and he was made the *'Arīd-i-Mumālīk* (the head-*mumshī* of the kingdom).

<sup>4</sup> 'Aḍd-ul-mulk fled from Barōda, but on the way the kōlis plundered all his equipage and things. Sultān Bahādur appointed Shamsiḥr-ul-mulk to seize 'Aḍd-ul-mulk; and he appointed Nizām-ul-mulk to attack Muḥṣif Khān. The rebels fled and sought the protec-

horsemen in advance to seize 'Imād-ul-Mulk. Of course the Ṭabaqāt also says that Tāj Khān was sent later to attack 'Imād-ul-mulk.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has گذر کرد, which I think would be better; but as the other MS., the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah all have عبور کرد, I have retained it.

<sup>2</sup> It appears from Firishtah that he was seized in the house of شاه چنور مدبئی who, according to the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 332, was not the man that had cursed Sultān Sikandar, but was the head keeper of the *dūrān*.

<sup>3</sup> Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 105) says that Imad-ul-Moolk's son was also executed, but this does not appear anywhere else. The actual words about the mode of punishment in Firishtah are سر تا ناخن پای زنده پوست کردند. As regards 'Imād-ul-mulk, however, Mir Abū Tūrab says, on page 3 of his Tarikh-i-Gujarāt, that در میدان دربار در میان بازار سر تا ناخن پای زنده پوست کردند, i.e., in the plain of the *darbār*, in the *bāzār* his skin was flayed, while he was still living, from his head to the nails of his toes.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. agrees generally with the text; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 106) says that the fugitives "sought refuge with Oodiy Sing. Raja of Poloh". This partly agrees with the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, which says that 'Aḍd-ul-mulk and Muḥṣif Khān fled to the hill country of Pal, Bayley, page 333.

tion of Rāy Singh; and the troops sent against them <sup>1</sup> returned after plundering their goods and chattels. After two or three days, news was brought that <sup>2</sup> the son of 'Arz-ul-mulk and Shāh Jū Sādīq and a number of the murderers of Sikandar Shāh had been slain in the house of Qadr Khān. <sup>3</sup> Bahā'-ul-mulk taking advantage of an opportunity fled from Chāmpānir. On the way, the *shahna* (police superintendent) of Dēhī seized him, and brought him before the Sultān. As he had inflicted a wound on Sultān Sikandar, and the wound which <sup>4</sup> 'Ibn-ud-dīn had inflicted on him was still fresh (i.e., unhealed), Sultān Bahādur ordered that he should be flayed, and then hanged. The three other men, who were among the murderers of Sultān Sikandar, were all (to use the quaint phraseology of the original) placed at the mouth of the cannon and sent into the air, or as one would say in ordinary language blown up at the mouths of cannon. In short, in a little while, all the murderers of Sultān Sikandar were put to death with great torture.

It so happened that on the day on which Sultān Bahādur entered Chāmpānir, Latif Khān, son of Muzaḥḥ Shāh, at the instigation of (some) *amīrs*, also came to the city and for some days remained concealed there. Qaiṣar Khān and Af Khān and some other *amīrs* sent a message to <sup>5</sup> Latif Khān that it was not fitting that he should remain there any longer; and he should in any case <sup>6</sup> conceal himself in some other corner. He became hopeless and scratching the <sup>7</sup> back of his

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has *مواجهت نمودند* instead of *مواجهت نمود*.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. have what I have got in the text. The lith. ed. agrees, with this difference that it has *يسرى عيسى الملك* instead of *يسرى عيسى الملك*. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has *يسرى عيسى الملك*. This appears to be correct. No person of the name of *يسرى عيسى الملك* is mentioned anywhere else.

<sup>3</sup> He was one of the murderers of Sultān Sikandar, whose services Sultān Bahādur had at first thought it advisable to accept, but who, now according to Firishtah, became doubtful of his safety and fled. See also note 5, page 332.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. has *عالم الدين*.

<sup>5</sup> One MS. omits the Khān after Latif.

<sup>6</sup> The words are *لا بد ترساند* in one MS. and in the lith. ed. They are *لا بد ترسانيد* in the other MS. I have accepted the latter, as it is more correct grammatically.

<sup>7</sup> The word *يسرى* is not to be found in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; but is in the other MS., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I have retained it, as

head, <sup>1</sup> went to the country of Māl. The Rāja of Māl did not show any favour to him. 'Add-ul-mulk and Muḥāfiẓ Khān then joined him, and they went from there to <sup>2</sup> Mūnkā; and there they passed the time in wandering about in the hilly country.

In short, Sultān Bahādur now commenced to attend to the welfare of the *ra'yats* and of the soldiery; and made all the people, and all sections of the community participators in his boundless largesses. He increased the stipends of the soldiers generally by <sup>3</sup> ten-twenties and ten-forties; and gave them one year's wages, and made them contented and thankful. He also gave to the *faqīrs*, who lived round the tombs in Sarkhēj and Batūh and Rasulābād happy by giving them stipends and allowances.

n 1. the back of the head that one scratches when in a quandary. پس سرخاریدن appears to be a Persian idiom.

<sup>1</sup> Firish-tah lith. ed. says that Latif Khān went to the country of Māl, but does not say what happened to him there, or whether he afterwards joined 'Add-ul-mulk and Muḥāfiẓ Khān. Col. Briggs says he went to Poloh. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, p. 333) does not appear to mention the fact that Latif Khān came to Chāmpānīr, and remained concealed there, but says 'Azd-ul-mulk and Muḥāfiẓ Khān fled to the country of Pāl, and joined Latif Khān. The Cambridge History of India, page 323, says he fled to Pīlānpur.

<sup>2</sup> The name is مونا in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. The lith. ed. of Firish-tah has مونا. Col. Briggs says, vol. IV, page 106, that Azd-ool-Mulk and Muḥāfiẓ Khān fled to Malwar, and in a note on the same page he gives the boundaries of Malwar as between the Nerbudda and Tapti rivers, N. and S., and Little Godpoor and Chōly Maheswar, E. and W. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari does not give the name of the place, but Bayley in a note on page 334, in which he refers to the Tabakāt, says that Latif Khān fled to the hill country of Bōngā.

<sup>3</sup> The meaning is not quite clear; it apparently means doubled and quadrupled, but this is not likely. Firish-tah lith. ed. inserts دہ سی between دہ سیست and چہل. This would be 300 per cent. None of the translations refers to this. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 333, says that "The Sultān now opened the hand of bounty, and like a cloud rained down gold and jewels and allowances and favours all round"; but there is no mention of the proportion by which the wages of the soldiers were increased. It appears from page 334, however, in connection with the allowances to Ghāzi Khān that دہ سیست does mean twofold, and consequently دہ سی and چہل دہ also mean threefold and fourfold.

<sup>1</sup> And as at that time, the fort of Chāmpānīr was the capital of Gujrāt, and the Sultāns ascended the throne there, he on the 15th of Dhī-qāḍah, at the moment chosen by the astrologers, adorned and decorated a jewelled throne, inlaid with gems, in the manner of the old Sultāns near the eastern *darbār*, and on the date previously mentioned, which was in the year 932 A.H., he placed the crown on his head, and according to the custom of his ancestors, sat on the throne. The great men and the *Sharīḥs* and the *amīrs* and the *Khāns* spoke words of congratulations, and carried out the ceremonies of making loyal offerings and wave offerings. On that day, a thousand persons had the distinction of robes of honour being conferred on them; and a number of people were honoured by the grant of titles. <sup>2</sup> Ghāzī Khān was then appointed to the government of Nadarbār and Sultānpūr; and although his allowances had been increased by ten-twenty (*i.e.*, double) at the accession at Ahmadābād, it was again doubled now.

At this time <sup>3</sup> news came that Latīf Khān had, at the instigation of Aḍḍ-ul-mulk and Muḥāfiẓ Khān, gone to the hills of <sup>4</sup> Āwās in the vicinity of Sultānpūr and Nadarbār, with the intention of creating a disturbance and raising a revolt. Sultān Bahādur ordered that an army should be sent, which would in co-operation with Ghāzī Khān crush and destroy him. <sup>5</sup> At this time, the date of the accession on

---

<sup>1</sup> This second coronation is mentioned by Firishṭah lith. ed. and very briefly by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 106). The *Mīrāt-i-Sikandārī* (Bayley, p. 334) also mentions it briefly after mentioning the famine.

<sup>2</sup> It appears from the *Mīrāt-i-Sikandārī*, Bayley, page 334, that the Sultān ordered Tāj Khān to command the army against Latīf Khān and his adherents; but Tāj Khān represented that Ghāzī Khān son of Ahmad Khān was the best man for the work, and the latter was then appointed to the *sūbah* of Nadarbār.

<sup>3</sup> According to the *Mīrāt-i-Sikandārī*, Bayley, page 333, the famine occurred before the receipt of the news of Latīf Khān's revolt, and the appointment of Ghāzī Khān, or at least the famine is mentioned there before the revolt.

<sup>4</sup> The place is so named in the MSS., in the lith. ed., and in the lith. ed. of Firishṭah; Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 106) calls it the Ahwas hills. They do not appear to be mentioned in the *Mīrāt-i-Sikandārī*.

<sup>5</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. have the text as I have it, but in the corresponding passage of Firishṭah there is the word پس before, and the word این after the word عقارن. This is, I think, a better reading. The date of the accession on the 15<sup>th</sup> of *dhūḥa* was the anniversary of the accession at Ahmadābād which took place on that day.

the *'Id-ul-duha* arrived. On this day the Sultān arranged a grand festive assembly, and again bestowed on many of the *amīrs* robes and belts and daggers and swords, and in this way made them pleased with him.

It so happened, that at this time a famine took place, and (the Sultān) ordered Hushiyār-ul-mulk, who was the treasurer, to attend at his stirrups, so that at the time when he was riding, he should give a <sup>1</sup> *Muzaffarī* to everyone who should ask for help. The Sultān rode out every day twice to play *chaugān*; and in every city many alms houses were established for *faqīrs* and poor people; and the Sultān <sup>2</sup> endeavoured with all his energy to ameliorate the condition of the *ra'iyats*; so that in a short time a new grandeur and splendour appeared in the country of Gujrāt.

A considerable time had not yet elapsed, when the men, who had been creating disturbances, began to move again. Shujā'-ul-mulk fled and joined Latif Khān, and Qaiṣar Khān who was one of the great *amīrs* of Muẓaffar Shāh sent a number of his retainers with him. As Qaiṣar Khān and <sup>3</sup> Uluḡ Khān had been in agreement with 'Imād-ul-mulk in the matter of the murder of Sultān Sikandar, and were afraid of suffering the punishments for their acts, they did not abandon their hostile attitude. The loyal *amīrs* having come to know of this informed the Sultān. <sup>4</sup> The latter sent Uluḡ Khān with a well

<sup>1</sup> The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 333, says, "a gold ashrafi". The Sultān's riding out to play *chaugān* is mentioned in this connection, I suppose, to indicate that the *Muzaffarīs* were given away on these occasions.

<sup>2</sup> The wording in the MS. and in the lith. ed. which is *همگی همت در ترفیه* appears to be defective. Either there should be the preposition *be* before *همگی*, or the words *همگی همت* should be omitted. These words are omitted in the corresponding sentence in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. and *Firishtah* lith. ed. and Col. Briggs and the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* have *الغ خان*, so I have taken that name, though the other MS. and the lith. ed. have *الف خان*.

<sup>4</sup> There is apparently some misstatement in the sequence of events. Apparently Uluḡ Khān had already been sent in command of the army sent against Latif Khān, when the loyal *amīrs* made the representation in the matter; but the difficulty is that it is said that Qaiṣar Khān and Uluḡ Khān were put into prison. Probably Uluḡ Khān was recalled, or he had not started, although the troops he was to command had. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 335,





complaint on a Friday, that they had not received their allowances, and did not allow the *Khuṭba* to be read. Sultān Bahādur excused the offence on account of his innate forbearance, and ordered the payment of their allowances. These men had intended to go to Latif Khān, and they had also instigated others to do so.

At this time a petition came from Ghāzī Khān to the effect that "Latif Khān has come to Sultānpūr with a large force and has raised the standard of hostility. I went and met him, and after the battle, 'Aḍ-ḍ-ḍ-mulk and Muḥāfiẓ Khān fled, and Rāy Bhīm with his brothers fell on the battlefield, and Latif Khān was wounded and taken prisoner". Sultān Bahādur immediately on hearing this news, sent Muḥib-ḍ-mulk, and a body of other *amīrs*, so that they might properly and kindly attend to the condition of Latif Khān, and bring him to his presence, after placing ointments on his wounds; but as he was mortally wounded he died on the way. He was buried in the village of Hālāl, one of the dependencies of Chāmpānūr, by the side of Sultān Sikandar. In the course of the same year <sup>1</sup> Naṣir Khān, who had received the title of Sultān Maḥmūd also died. The Sultān appointed a number of beadsmen ( *وَقَالَ* ) at his brothers' tombs, and ordered the daily distribution of cooked and uncooked food there.

In the same year, also, news came that <sup>2</sup> Rāy Singh, Rāja of Māl on hearing of the execution of Qaiṣar Khān, sought an opportunity

---

made their conquest in the *Jāma* Masjid, and this is also indicated by the fact mentioned in the text, that they prevented the reader of the public prayers to read them. Firishtah also does not attribute the act of the Sultān to his forbearance, but says he knew they intended to go over to Latif Khān; and therefore ordered their allowances to be paid, as a matter of policy. Their intention of going over to Latif Khān is also mentioned in the text.

<sup>1</sup> This was a young king who was placed on the throne by 'Imād-ḍ-mulk after the murder of Sultān Sikandar. The Cambridge History of India, page 323, says that he was secretly put to death, but I do not know the authority on which this statement is made. Neither the *Ṭabaqāt* nor *Firishtah* nor the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* says so, though it is quite possible that the young prince was secretly murdered.

<sup>2</sup> The reason of the hostility of Rāy Singh on hearing the news of the execution of Qaiṣar Khān, and of his invading the Sultān's dominion, and of sacking the town of Dādūd is not at all clear, nor is it clear why Rāy Singh should have seized a lot of the properties of Dād'-ḍ-mulk, the son of Qaiṣar Khān. The Cambridge History of India, page 323, says that it was the murder of the

and sacked the town of <sup>1</sup>Dahūd, and much property belonging to Dīā'-ul-mulk, son of Qaiṣar Khān fell into his hands. The Sultān on hearing this news became anxious, and wanted to advance in person. Tāj Khān, however, submitted to him, that at the beginning of a reign, many occurrences like this take place, and His Majesty should not at all allow any distress or pain to lodge in his heart. If this slave is commanded to undertake this service, he would with the divine favour and the auspiciousness of His Majesty's attention, chastise that turbulent man, the Rāja of Māl, as he deserves. The Sultān immediately conferred a robe of honour on him, and sent one *lakh* of horsemen with him for the punishment of Rāy Singh, the Rāja of Māl. Tāj Khān

child Mahmūd II, that alienated Uchi Singh of Pānampur, or, as he is described in the text and in Firishtah, of Rāy Singh, Rāja of Māl. But it is not clear why this Hindū chief should have taken the murder of the young Mu-salmān prince so much to heart as to put his country into such danger by raiding the territory of the powerful Sultān of Gujrāt. The text both of the *Tabaqāt* and of *Firishtah* make it clear that it was on hearing of the execution of Qaiṣar Khān, قتل قیصر, *خان* that he sought an opportunity and sacked Dahūd. In respect of Nasir Khān both the *Tabaqāt* and *Firishtah* had used the word, وفات, death. So that when they speak of the قتل قیصر خان, the name قیصر خان cannot be a mistake for نصیر خان. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 335, does not directly connect the raid by Rāi Singh of Pāl, as he is called there, either with the execution of Kaisar Khān or the death of Nasir Khān but it connects it indirectly with the former, and not in any way with the latter. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* does not mention the fact of the property of Zāh-ul-mulk being taken in the text, but Bayley in a note on page 336 quoting from the *Tabaqāt* says that Rāi Singh "made his attack on hearing of the execution of Kaisar Khān, apparently because he supposed that that showed disunion in Bahādur Shāh's camp". This is not a very cogent reason, but I mention it for what it is worth. Later on in the same note Bayley calls Zāh-ul-mulk, the son of Nasir Khān; and that Rāi Singh's son afterwards came in and submitted and was honoured with a dress (*Khil'at*). Both these statements appear to me to be incorrect. The *Tabaqāt* and *Firishtah* both call Dīā'-ul-mulk, the son of Qaiṣar Khān. There is no Nasir Khān mentioned anywhere, about this time except the young prince, who certainly had no sons. As to the visit of Rāy Singh's son to the Sultān, it will be seen from the text that it was Rāmū Sānkā's son and not Rāy Singh's, who came and paid a visit to the Sultān. The lith. ed. of the *Tabaqāt*, however, says that it was Rāy Singh's son. Probably Bayley had some MS. before him, that also said so.

<sup>1</sup> دهور in the text.

<sup>1</sup> invaded the country of Māl and began to devastate it. Rāy Singh then, with great humility and distress, submitted a petition for the pardon of his offences, through the intervention of Shurf-ul-mulk who was one of Sultān Muẓaffar's *amīrs*. It did not, however, meet with acceptance; and Tāj Khān penetrated into the country and stretched his hands to plunder and ravage it; and did not leave anything undone in devastating it. Rāy Singh chose a difficult position, and prepared to fight there, and Tāj Khān standing firm and strong met him. A large number of native and strong men were killed on the side of Rāy Singh, and <sup>2</sup> only one man was killed on the side of the Musalmāns. Tāj Khān remained one month in the country of Māl, after which he hastened to the service of the Sultān.

In the month of Rabī-ul-āwwal of the same year, Sultān Bahādur left his capital with the object of hunting. At this time a number of the *ra'iṣats* of Kanbāyet came, and made complaint of the acts of the officer in-charge of the town. The Sultān sent Tāj Khān to arrange the affairs of that neighbourhood; and issued an order for the dismissal of the *dārōgha* of Kanbāyet. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Chāmpānūr, the son of Rīnū Sūnkū came to render homage, and after staying there for some days, and after being made happy by favours and kindness, received permission to leave.

In the year 934 A.H., 1528 A.D., the Sultān cast the shadow of conquest over the countries of Idar and Bākar, and having in a short time conquered those countries, returned to Chāmpānūr. He then went with a small retinue to rebuild the fort of Bahrōj, and after

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a little difference in the readings. One MS. has در امدۀ بنیاد , i.e., having invaded the country began to devastate it. The other has only در امد , i.e., invaded the country. The lith. ed. has در امد. I have adopted the first reading as it gives reason for Rāy Singh's humility. Firishtah also has the same reading.

<sup>2</sup> This is somewhat curious, but Firishtah also says و از مسلمانان زیاده از یک نفر بقتل نیامد , i.e., of the Musalmāns more than one man was not killed. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 108) also says the same thing, but he describes it as a remarkable fact; and he says only one man of Tāj Khan's army is said to have fallen. The Mīrāt-i-Sikandari also says the same thing, and says that the man who was killed was named Muhammad Hasan (Bayley, p. 336). M. Hidayat Husain has adopted و از مسلمانان, یک سو نفر بقتل آمد in the text-edition.

finishing his work there, went to Kanbūyet. One day, when he was amusing himself on the coast, a ship happened to arrive from the port Dip. The men, who came in it, reported, that a ship belonging to the *firangīs* had been cast ashore by the wind. Qawām-ul-mulk had seized the property on board the ship, and was <sup>1</sup> causing the *firangīs* the hardship of being made slaves. On hearing this news after breaking his <sup>2</sup> fast the Sultān travelled to Dip by road. Qawām-ul-mulk hastened to meet him, and produced the *firangīs* before him. He invited them to accept Islām, and having made a large number of them Musalmāns, raised the standard of return.

In the same year <sup>3</sup> a letter came from 'Ādil Khān, governor of Āsir, who was a nephew (sister's son) of Sultān Bahādur, the purport

<sup>1</sup> The meaning of the words which are *بذل عبودیت مبتلا دارد* in the MSS. (though the word *بذل* is written as *بدل* in one of them) is not quite clear, but I suppose my translation is correct. Firishtah has the word *بذیل* instead of *بذل*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 109) says the crew had been made prisoners.

<sup>2</sup> The word is *افتار* in both MSS. and *انطار* in the lith. ed. Firishtah says the Sultān became very pleased on hearing the news, and agrees generally as to the facts of the incidents; and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 109) says in the text that all the Europeans taken on this occasion were circumcised, and became Mahomedans; but in a note he says that "The Portuguese historian states that they resisted being converted and were eventually released. James de Mesquita was the name of the officer; and his whole crew consisted of only sixteen men in a boat. It is certain that James de Mesquita was with Bahadur Shah afterwards, at the siege of Chittoor, and was employed by him as his envoy to Nuno de Cunha in the year that Bahadur Shah lost his life". This incident does not appear to be mentioned in either the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* or the *Cambridge History of India*.

<sup>3</sup> The tenor of the letter is rather vague and disjointed. Firishtah lith. ed. agrees generally but the names of the party are somewhat different. 'Ādil Khān is called Mīrān Muḥammad Shāh, Nizām-ul-mulk Bahārī Burhān Nizām Shāh Bahārī, Barid Bidadī Qūshin Barid and 'Imād-ul-mulk, 'Alā-ud-din 'Imād Shāh; and instead of the three hundred elephants mentioned in the *Ṭabaqāt*, Firishtah says some elephants, *چند سلسلہ فیل*, were carried away as plunder. Col. Briggs's account is similar to Firishtah; but he calls Mīrān Muḥammad Shāh "Meeran Mahomed Khan". The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 340, generally agrees; but says that the confederacy against 'Imād-ul-Mulk Gāwālī or Mīrān Muḥammad Khān consisted of besides Nizām-ul-Mulk and Barid, Khudāwand Khān Pāthirī, and 'Ala-ul-Mulk and others; but it says nothing of the looting of the elephants and the taking of the fort of Māhūr; but Bayley mentions them

of which was this. "As 'Imād-ul-mulk Kāwīl had prayed with humility for help from this *faqīr*, and Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri and <sup>1</sup>Malik Barīd of Bīdar had forcibly entered into the country Kāwīl, the *faqīr* went to help and reinforce 'Imād-ul-mulk; and a great battle took place. The *faqīr* drove away the men in front of him. Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri, who was in ambush, attacked and defeated 'Imād-ul-mulk; and carried away as plunder three hundred elephants belonging to the *faqīr*. The *faqīr* has <sup>2</sup>now come, relying on the generosity of Your Majesty. Whatever noble order is issued by you will be entirely for the welfare of all; and he (I suppose, Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri) has violently taken possession of the fort of <sup>3</sup>Māhūr, which is the greatest fort in Kāwīl." An order was issued to the following effect, "Last year a petition came from 'Imād-ul-mulk, and Malik 'Ain-ul-mulk, the governor of Nahrwāla, in accordance with orders, went and amicably settled the matter between the parties. Now that this violence has been perpetrated by Nizām-ul-mulk; therefore in accordance with the saying—the offender is a tyrant—he is the tyrant and 'Imād-ul-mulk the victim of his oppression; and it is a duty incumbent on the energy of all merciful people to help the oppressed." In the month of Muḥarram in the year 935 A.H., September, 1528 A.D., the Sultān advanced with an immense army with the object of conquering the Deccan, and encamped in the town of Barōda; and a long time elapsed there for the mustering of the troops.

<sup>4</sup> About the middle of that year 935 A.H., 1529 A.D., Jām Fīrūz, the ruler of Thatha, had to leave his country owing to the growing power of the Arghūns, and came and joined Sultān Bahādur.

---

in a foot note. The account of the Cambridge History of India, page 324, is somewhat similar; but it says in addition, that the cause of the quarrel was the possession of the town and district of Pāthri on the Godāvarī, which belonged to the ruler of Berar by right but were coveted and had been annexed by that of Ahmadnagar ('Alā-ud-dīn 'Imād Shāh).

<sup>1</sup> مدبر بدری in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> The word is حال in one MS., but حالها in the other and in the lith. ed.

<sup>3</sup> The word is مکادومل in one MS.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah's account agrees, but he does not name the Arghūns, but substitutes Mughūls. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 110) calls them Arghoons. Mirāt-i-Sikandari does not mention the allowance of twelve lakhs of tankas.

The latter showed kindness to him, and fixed a stipend of twelve *lakhs* of *tankas* for his personal <sup>1</sup> expenses; and promised that, "God willing I shall give you your hereditary dominion after recovering it from the Maghūls".

As the fame of the grandeur of Bahādur Shāh, and the report of his imperial gifts spread in the inhabited fourth part of the world, the Rāys from near and far turned their faces to his threshold, which was a seat of prosperity. The <sup>2</sup> nephew of the Rāja of Gwālīar with a body of *Pūrabīa* Rājputs came, and were enlisted among his special attendants. <sup>3</sup> Bahrūn, son of Prithī Rāj, nephew of Rānā Sānkā, also came with some notable Rājputs, and entered his service. Some *Dakinī sardārs* also came and attained to the good fortune of an audience (of the Sultān). All of them, in accordance with their status and position, obtained a share in his favours and gifts.

As a long time elapsed (in the Sultān's) residence in Chāmpānūr, 'Imād-ul-mulk sent his son Ja'far Khān to wait on the Sultān, and represented that, owing to his arrogance and pride, Niẓām-ul-mulk Bāhūrī had no inclination towards a treaty of peace. If the Sultān would once advance into the Deccan, the object of this slave would be attained. The Sultān granted his prayer, and decided to invade the Deccan. About this time, Ja'far Khān submitted, that if the Sultān permitted, he would like to go and see the city of Aḥmadābād and the country of Kanbāyet; and would soon come back to attend on the Sultān. His prayer was allowed, and he had arrived in Kanbāyet, when he was informed, that the Sultān had moved out of Aḥmadābād to carry out his expedition into the Deccan, and had

<sup>1</sup> The word *خرج* is left out from one MS.

<sup>2</sup> His name is given in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 343, as Nar Sing Dōō brother's son of Mān Singh, Rājah of Gwālīār.

<sup>3</sup> The name is *پتر* or *بنر* in the MSS., and *مین* in the lith. ed., and *پرون* in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*. Col. Briggs calls him Srooputty Ray (evidently mixing up the names of the father and the son), nephew of Rana Sanka. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* says that it was Prithi Rāj, nephew of Rānā Sānkā and not his son who came. Following the *Tabaqāt* and *Firishtah*, I have adopted Bahrūn as the name of the Rājput chief, son of Prithi Rāj, who came. Of all the names it is the only one which has any similarity to a Hindū name. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has *راج بن پرتوی* in the text-edition.

encamped in the town of <sup>1</sup> Dabōhī. Ja'far Khān waited on the Sultān there. <sup>2</sup> The Sultān halted there for some time and again returned to <sup>3</sup> Muḥammadābād and passed the rainy season there. <sup>4</sup> He then in the year 937 A.H. marched towards Bākar and Īdar; and he sent Khudāwand Khān and 'Imād-ul-mulk from the village of Khānpūr with a well-equipped army and many elephants to Bākar; and himself proceeded towards Kanbāyet. He spent one day at Kanbāyet, and then embarked in a ship for the Dīp. At the latter place all the stuffs and other merchandise, which were in the ships, that arrived from the various ports round about, were put into various store-houses. Among these things, there were one thousand and six hundred maunds of roses (or rose water) from Damasens. He also showed very great kindness to the body of *Rūmīs* (Turks) who had <sup>5</sup> come with Muṣṭafī



Rūmī, and were in a strange country. He arranged residences for them; and returned after recommending them to the favour of Malīk Arāz.

When after travelling over the various stages, he arrived at Chāmpānī. <sup>1</sup> Umr Khān and Quṭb Khān, and a number of other *amīrs* of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm, who had, for fear of His Majesty Firdūs Makānī, fled to Gujrāt, waited upon the Sulṭān; and were exalted to high ranks. On the 1st day <sup>2</sup> three thousand robes of honour woven all over with gold thread, and fifty horses, and some *lakhs* of *tanikas* in cash were bestowed on them; and after pleasing their hearts, the Sulṭān had the drum beaten for a march to Mahrāsa. After his arrival there, Khudāwand Khān and the other *amīrs* came and waited upon him. He then penetrated into Bākar by successive marches; and arranged for the perfect government of that territory, and appointed *thēnadārs* at all necessary stations. Pars Rām, the Rāja of Bākar, becoming thoroughly helpless entered the Sulṭān's service. His son having attained to the nobility of Islām became a Musalmān in the presence of Sulṭān Bahādur. But <sup>3</sup> Jagā, Pars Rām's brother, with a number of insurgents moved about in the hills and forests. Afterwards he went for fear of his life to <sup>4</sup> Ratan Sēn, son of Rānā

<sup>1</sup> One MS. inserts *و قاضی خان* and Qāzī Khān, after *قوتب خان* Quṭb Khān.

<sup>2</sup> It is *مئید* in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of Firishṭah; but I think *مئید* or three hundred was the correct number.

<sup>3</sup> The name is *چکا* in the MSS., and *چنکا* in the lith. ed. It is *چکا* in the lith. ed. of Firishṭah. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 112) calls him Jugur Ray. The name does not appear to be mentioned in the text of the *Mīrāt-i-Sikandari*, but in a note, on pages 347, 348, he is called Chagā or Jagā or Jagar. M. Hidayat Hosain has *چکا* in the text-edition.

<sup>4</sup> The name is *رتن سینی*, Ratan Si in the MS. and also in the lith. ed. of Firishṭah, but it is *رتن سین*, Ratan Sēn in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. Col. Briggs has Rana Rurrun. He is called Rānā Ratani in the text of the *Mīrāt-i-Sikandari*. Payley, page 350, but in a note it is said that he was variously called Ratan Si, Ratan Sēn and Ratani Chand. The Cambridge history of India (p. 326) call him Ratan Singh, in an unsuccessful attempt to give the Sanskrit form of the name; but just as Sangrāma Singh is not correct Sanskrit so Ratan Singh also is not correct Sanskrit. It should be Ratna Sinha. But the Musalmān historians and even Tod, the author of the *Rājasthān* are content with Sanga Rānā or Rānān Sākhā, and Ratna and Bikramājī; the names of the brother and successor of

Sānkū for protection; and made him the medium for his entering the service (of the Sultān). It so happened that the Sultān had at that time gone to Bānswāla on a hunting expedition. Ratan Sēn sent emissaries there and with great humility and meekness prayed for the pardon of Jagā's offences. The Sultān acceded to his prayer, and sent for Jagā. He then laid the foundation of a noble mosque in the <sup>1</sup> village and *ghāt* of Karchī, and gave that town (Karchī) to Prithī Rāj; and divided the rest of the territory of Bākar between <sup>2</sup> Prithī Rāj and Jagā in equal shares.

He remained there for some days with the object of hunting, when scouts brought the information, that Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji,

---

Ratan Sēn which the author of the Cambridge History of India has correctly transliterated into Vikramāditya.

<sup>1</sup> The name of the village is دکیات کرجی Dakiāt Karjī in one MS. and دکلنیات کرجی Daklmiāt Karjī and دکھات کرجی Dakhāt Karjī, in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it looks like لہات کرجی Lahiāt Karjī. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 113) says that the king having caused a mosque to be built in the village of Larky G'hat gave it over in perpetuity to Jugut Ray. Whether the mosque or the village was given in perpetuity to him is not clear and in any case the statement differs from that of Firishtah, who says the Sultān gave the town to Prithī Rāj. It appears from the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 348, that *wakils* of Ratan Rājah of Chitōr waited upon the Sultān at the pass of Karchī. I think therefore that the correct reading is موضع وگہات کرجی, the village and *ghāt* of Karchī, and I have adopted this. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has موضع دکھات کرجی in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> There must be some mistake here. Pars Rām and not Prithī Rāj was the Rāja of Bākar. Prithī Rāj appears to have been Rāja of Dūngarpūr. It is not at all clear why he should have got half of Bākar to the exclusion of Pars Rām and his son, the former of whom had entered the Sultān's service, and the latter had become a Musalmān. The Cambridge History of India, page 325, says in a few words what happened to Bāker (as it calls it), and Bānswārā. It says he "led an expedition in to Bāker and Bānswārā. The Rānā, Ratan Singḥ II, who had succeeded Sangrama after the battle of Sikrī interceded for the two chiefs, and Bahādur stayed his hand". I am afraid this does not give much information of what actually happened, and what information is given is not accurate. There is no mention of the division of Bākar, whether it was between Prithī Rāj and Jāga, or between Pars Rām and the latter. There was also no expedition into Bānslah or Bānswārā. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī says definitely that the Sultān left his army behind, and went to Bānswāla on a hunting excursion and nothing appears to have been done in respect of him or of the Rāja. The names Ratan Singh and Sangrama are also both incorrect.

who had been bound by ties of gratitude to the late Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh, and had received many favours from him, had sent <sup>1</sup> Sharzāh Khān, who was the civil and military governor of Mandū, that he might plunder and ravage some of the towns in the territory of Chitōr; and Ratan Sēn, son of Rānā Sānkā had with a large force plundered and devastated the villages of Sipla and Balāvat; and was confronting Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji at Ujjain. <sup>2</sup> Ratan Sēn's ambassadors also came at this time, and represented to the Sultān, that he should forbid Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji, so that the latter might not without any reason move the chain of hostility. They also informed him, that Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji had gone from Ujjain to Sarāngpūr; and had taken Silhadī *Pūrabia* with him, with the object of putting him to death; and Silhadī having become aware of his intention had in conjunction with Sikandar Khān Satwāi gone to Chitōr, and had sought the protection of Ratan Sēn; and Sikandar Khān and Bhūpat, son of Silhadī, were coming from there to wait on His Majesty. Accordingly on the 27th of Jamādi-āwwal, Sikandar Khān and Bhūpat came and waited on the Sultān. The latter bestowed on them seven hundred robes woven entirely of gold thread and seventy horses; and did everything to please them.

When Sultān Maḥmūd received information of the departure of Sikandar Khān and Bhūpat, he sent Daryā Khān, as an ambassador, with a message that he also intended to have the honour of presenting himself; but the acquisition of that blessing had remained in abeyance owing to certain reasons; but God willing he intended on this occasion to have the great pleasure of meeting His Majesty. Sultān Bahādur

<sup>1</sup> The lith. ed. of *Firishtah* appears to be defective here, as it says that Sharzāh Khān after plundering certain towns in the territory of Chitōr, was confronting Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji at Ujjain. Col. Briggs does not say that Ratan Sēn plundered any villages in Mālwa, or was confronting Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji at Ujjain. On the other hand, he says that Shirza Khan had passed through Oojoin to Sarungpoor. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 349, also does not say that Ratan Sēn had plundered any villages in Mālwa; but it does mention that he was confronting Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji at Ujjain.

<sup>2</sup> *Firishtah* and Col. Briggs and the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* generally agree with the text; but Col. Briggs says that Moyin Khan, son of Sikundur Khan Mewaty, and not the latter himself had fled to Chittor. Sikandar Khān is said in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 349, to have been the governor of Siwās.

said to Daryā Khān, "On various occasions, the glad tidings of a visit have reached my ears. If Sultān Maḥmūd comes and meets me, I shall certainly not give an asylum to the fugitives from his courts". He then granted permission to the <sup>1</sup> ambassador of Sultān Maḥmūd to return, after bestowing favours on him. Then he marched towards Bānswāla, and when he arrived at the *ghāt* or pass of Karchī, Ratan Sēn and Silhadī hastened to wait on him. On the first day the Sultān bestowed on them thirty elephants and one thousand five hundred robes of honour made of stuff of woven gold thread. After a few days, Ratan Sēn obtained leave to go to Chitōr; but Silhadī having elected to enter the Sultān's service stayed on.

Sultān Bahādur depending on the promise of Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji proceeded towards <sup>2</sup> Sambla; and determined, that if Sultān Maḥmūd came, he would perform the ceremonies of receiving and hospitably entertaining him; and then go as far as Kanbāyet and the pass of Dēvla, and after bidding him farewell there returned to the capital. At this place Muḥammad Khān Āsirī came and waited upon him. <sup>3</sup> When the latter arrived at Sambla he waited for ten days for Sultān Maḥmūd. After that Daryā Khān again came from Sultān Maḥmūd, and informed him that his master had fallen from his horse while hunting, and had broken his right arm; and it was not fit that he should come in his present condition. The Sultān said,

<sup>1</sup> The word is فرستاده in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; but ایلچی in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt.

<sup>2</sup> The name is سنبلہ Sanblīa in one MS. سنبلہ Sanbla in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah; and سندله Sandla in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 114) has Taudla, and the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 350, has "the village of Sambaliah". سنبلہ Sanbla in the text is apparently a mistake for Sambla.

<sup>3</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 326, gives a very good summary of the matters in dispute at this time between the Sultān of Gujārāt and Mālwa, but unfortunately ends with a mistake, when it says, "Sultān Mahmud owed his tenure of his throne to the capture of Māndū from rebellious Rājputs by Maḥmūd Begarha". It needs scarcely be said that it was Sultān Muẓaffar, and not Sultān Maḥmūd Begarha, who captured Māndū from the rebellious Rājputs (see pp. 318, 319 of the Cambridge History of India itself). It may also be mentioned that مندو should be transliterated as Māndū and not as Māndū.



was posted to the west at the battery of <sup>1</sup> Shāhpūr, and <sup>2</sup> Ulugh Khān to Bhilpūr. He sent the *Pūrabīa* contingent to <sup>3</sup> Pahalwānīa; and himself took up his quarters in the *maḥals* (palaces) at <sup>4</sup> Muḥammadpūr.

On the <sup>5</sup> 9th Sha'bān, 937 A.H., at the time of the true dawn, the standards of Bahādur Shāh rose above the horizon of the fort of Mandū. At that very moment, Chānd Khān, son of Sultān Muẓaffar, got out of the fort and fled. Sultān Maḥmūd armed himself and with the few men that he had, came out to give battle; but as he <sup>6</sup> did not see that he was sufficiently strong to do so, he went into the palace

<sup>1</sup> The name is شاه پور, Shāhpūr in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. It is شاه پور Shāhpūr in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 351, has "the trenches at Shāhpūr".

<sup>2</sup> The name is خان الخ Ulugh Khān in both MSS. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has لقمان Luqmān, which is certainly incorrect, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 115) improves it by making it Lokmun Sing. The lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt has خان الف Alf Khān and the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī has Alaf Khān. As to the name of the place the MSS. have پهل پور Bhilpūr and پهل پور Pahlpūr. The lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt has پهل پور Bhilpūr and that of Firishtah پهل پور Bahlpūr. Col. Briggs has Seetulpoor, and the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 351, Bahlōlpūr.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS. have پهلوانیه Pahalwānīa, and the lith. ed. has بهگوانه Bhagwāna. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has سلوانه Salhwāna. Col. Briggs has Julwara, and the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī has Bahalwānah. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted سہلوانیہ Sahlwānīa, in the text-edition.

<sup>4</sup> The MSS. have محمد پور Muḥammadpūr, and محمود پور Maḥmūd pūr, while the lith. ed. has محمود آباد Maḥmūdābād. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has محمود پور Maḥmūd pūr, and Col. Briggs has Mahomedpoor, while the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 351, does not state where the Sultān took up his quarters, but says that on the 20th Rajab he advanced his camp to Maḥmūd pūr.

<sup>5</sup> The date is the 9th Sha'bān in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. and also in Col. Briggs, but the lith. ed. of Firishtah has the night of the 29th Sha'bān, and the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 351, has the same date. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī describes how Sultān Bahādar himself with some great men effected an entrance into the fort by climbing a steep and high hill on the side of Sangār Chitōrī. The exploit was something like that of Humāyūn, who six years later, in 942 A.H., captured Chāmpānīr, by climbing a steep hill, by driving spikes into it. (See translation, vol. II, pages 54, 55.)

<sup>6</sup> One MS. has نداشت, but the other and the lith. ed. have ندید.

<sup>1</sup> to slay his wife and children. Sultān Bahādur's soldiers surrounded the *maḥal* (palace), and sent a message that there was full assurance of safety to the inmates and to the *amīrs*; and no one would interfere with the property or the honour of any single person. Some of Sultān Maḥmūd's loyal adherents made him refrain from the slaughter of his family; and told him, whatever unkindness the *Bādshah* of Gujrāt might show to him, his kindness and generosity would be greater than those of others. There was also a strong likelihood, that he would follow the example of his father and would leave the kingdom of Mālwa in the possession of Sultān Maḥmūd's servants. About this time, Sultān Bahādur ascended to the top of *La'l Maḥal*, and sent a man to wait on Sultān Maḥmūd. The latter came with seven of the *amīrs*. <sup>2</sup> Sultān Bahādur received him with respect and courtesy, and embraced him; and tried to please him. Then when they began to converse with each other, Sultān Maḥmūd showed a little harshness in his language. This displeased Sultān Bahādur; and a silence fell on the meeting. Then Sultān Maḥmūd and his son were placed under arrest, and sent to Chānpānīr; and Bahādur Shāh took up his residence

---

<sup>1</sup> Wishing apparently to follow the Rājput rite of *janhar*, but Firishtah says *بواسطه رعایت احوال عیال و اطفال برگشته جانب محل خرد شتافت*, from which it would appear that he intended to look after his family and children, and not to kill them. As to what happened later, Firishtah follows the *Ṭabaqāt* almost *verbatim*. But the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 352, says that "the plunder and the killing and the making of prisoners went on for one watch; and then a proclamation of quarter and safety was made". The date according to *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* was the 9th (and not the 20th) Sha'ban, 937 A.H., 28th March, 1531 A.D. Col. Briggs gives the date of the 9th Shaban, February 26th and the *Cambridge History of India*, page 327, has March 17th.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah leaves out the show of courtesy and respect and the embrace; but says that Sultān Bahādur was inclined to forgive Sultān Maḥmūd, but when he asked the latter, why he had not come to meet him, he gave a harsh reply, after which things happened as stated in the *Ṭabaqāt*. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*'s version (Bayley, pp. 352, 353) is somewhat different. It says that Sultān Maḥmūd sought safety by asking for quarter and mercy, and came out with seven sons to wait on Sultān Bahādur. He was placed in the custody of trustworthy guards, and on the 12th Muharram he was sent to Gujarāt. This last date can scarcely be correct, as there is an interval of four months between Sha'ban and Muharram. The account given in the *Cambridge History of India*, page 327, appears to be a brief summary of that in the *Ṭabaqāt*.

at Mandū. He gave permission to most of his *amīrs* to go back to Gujrāt, to their own *jāgīrs*.

After the rains, Sultān Bahādur <sup>1</sup> went to see Burhānpūr and Asīr; and there Nizām-ul-mulk Dakīnī joined his service. <sup>2</sup> He conferred on him the title of Muḥammad Shāh, and then returned to Mandū. About this time it became known that Silhādī <sup>3</sup> Pūrabia was not inclined to come and wait on the Sultān, for the reason, that he had in the time of Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji taken some Musalmān women; and in fact even some of the members of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn's harem into his own house, and had kept them there. Sultān Bahādur ordered that whether he came or not, it was incumbent on him (*i.e.*, the Sultān), that he should release the Musalmān women from the disgrace of *kufr* (heathenism) and the wretchedness of the slavery of *Kāfīrs*, and should give condign punishment to Silhādī. For this purpose he sent <sup>4</sup> Muqbal Khān to Chāmpānīr, so that he might go there and guard the fort and send Ikhtiyār Khān, with artillery and troops and treasure. Ikhtiyār Khān came with a large army, and joined the Sultān in the town of Dhār, on the 20th Rabi'-ul-ākhir, 938 A.H. Sultān Bahādur <sup>5</sup> proclaimed that he was going back to Gujrāt;

<sup>1</sup> There is a slight variation in the reading in the MSS. One has *بسیر اسیر* *Basīr Asīr*, while the other has *بسیر برهانپور و اسیر*. The lith. ed. has *برسر* *Basr*, which is incorrect.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah says that he did so because he wanted that Nizām-ul-mulk Dakīnī, or as Firishtah calls him Burhān Nizām Shāh Bāhri would help him in the war with Humāyūn, which he intended to carry on; but as a matter of fact, the opposite of this happened, for Nizām-ul-mulk sent an emissary to Humāyūn, and wanted him to come and attack Gujrāt. The Cambridge History of India, page 327, does not mention this, but it describes the interview between Bahādur Shāh and Burhān Nizām Shāh.

<sup>3</sup> The suffix *Purabiya* is omitted in one MS. The Cambridge History of India, page 327, does not mention anything about Silhādī having taken Musalmān women into his house, but says that he showed no disposition to fulfil his promise to return.

<sup>4</sup> It appears that Sultān Bahādur gave out that he was going to Gujrāt, and went away as if on a hunting excursion to Dībālpūr, etc., so that Silhādī might not take fright, and go away to Ratan Sēn, son of Rānā Sānkā. This is expressly stated in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*.

<sup>5</sup> He is also called *مقبل خان* *Muqbal Khān* by Firishtah: but is called *Mukarrib Khān* (*مقرب خان*) in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*. Bayley, page 356, and is there described as brother of Ikhtiyār Khān.



and went to Mandū, so that after making the necessary preparations there, he might commence his march towards Gujrāt. He left Ikhtiyār Khān in charge of the government of Mandū, and encamped at Na'leha on the 25th of the month of Jamādi-ul-āwwal. At this time Bhūpat, son of Silhadi, submitted to the Sultān, "As the sublime standards are advancing towards Gujrāt, if this slave obtains permission to go to Ujjain, he would bring Silhadi to wait on Your Majesty after giving him assurances of safety". The Sultān gave him permission, but with great caution himself advanced towards Ujjain by successive marches. On the 15th of that month, he arrived at the town of Dhār and leaving the army there went away to <sup>1</sup> Dīlālpūr, Banharla and Sa'dulpūr, as if on a hunting excursion.

Silhadi on hearing this news left Bhūpat at Ujjain; and came and waited on the Sultān. <sup>2</sup> Amin Naṣr who had been sent to summon him told the Sultān in private, that he had brought Silhadi, by deceiving him with a promise of the grant of Kanbūyet and a <sup>3</sup> *krōr* in cash.

<sup>1</sup> About Dīlālpūr there is no dispute; it is spelt ديبالپور in the MSS., and in the lith. ed.; but the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* calls it Dīpālpūr. The second name is بانهارلا Banharla, and تهارلا Taharla in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* or in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 117) calls it Bensrode. The third place is سعدالپور Sa'dulpūr in the MS. and in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*. In the lith. ed. of the *Tabaqāt* it is رسوالپور Rasūlpūr. Col. Briggs calls it Shoojalpoor. It is called 'Adlpūr in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 357, and Bayley says in a note, "The Tab. Akbari calls it Sādulpūr".

<sup>2</sup> This man's name is variously given. Both the MSS. call him اعمین نصیر Amin Naṣr, while the lith. ed. has امیر نصیر Amir Naṣr. *Firishtah* lith. ed. has Amir Naṣr, and Col. Briggs has Ameer Nuseer. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 356, calls him Malik Amin Nas, and it is said there, that Nas was probably a nickname, and means, among other things, one who is beginning to be corpulent. The *Cambridge History of India*, page 327, calls the man Nassan Khān, and says that he had been sent to Raisen and brought Silhadi to the court. According to the other historians he was sent, but Silhadi came only on receiving his son's message.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has قنک after کجور, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. do not have it. *Firishtah* says the same thing but in a different order. According to him Silhadi had no wish to submit to the Sultān, and would not have if he had not been deceived by the offer of Kanbūyet and a *krōr* of tankas. The *Mirāt-i-*

As Silhadi had no thought of remaining in allegiance to the Sultān, and wanted to give up his fort and to go to Mēwār; if he now got permission to leave,<sup>1</sup> it would be difficult to see him again. The Sultān then started from Sa'dulpūr for Dhār, and talked with the *amīrs*, and his other adherents about seizing Silhadi. When he arrived at the camp, he left the army outside, and took up his residence in the fort of Dhār. He took Silhadi with him. When the Sultān got inside the fort, the men who had been directed to seize Silhadi, came and took him with the two other *Pūrabās* who were with him into custody. At this time one of Silhadi's attendants raised a clamour, and placed his hand on his<sup>2</sup> dagger. Silhadi told him, "Do you want to kill me". The man replied "I wanted to do it for your sake, but as it causes injury to you, now I can smite myself, so that I might not see you in captivity"; and striking his dagger under his abdomen went to<sup>3</sup> hell. When the news of Silhadi's arrest was spread about, the Gujrāt army and the populace of the city plundered his camp, and killed a large number of his followers; and his elephants and horses and equipage were seized for the Sultān's government. Those who escaped the sword, fled and joined Bhūpat.

Towards the end of the day Sultān Bahādur sent<sup>4</sup> 'Imād-ul-mulk to attack Bhūpat. He left Khudāwand Khān to accompany the camp; and in the morning himself started towards Ujjain. 'Imād-ul-mulk told him at this time, that before his arrival, Bhūpat had received the news of Silhadi having been seized, and he had fled and gone to Chitōr. Sultān Bahādur conferred the government of Ujjain

Sikandari, Bayley, page 357, says the promise was to give him the port of Kamblāiat and *lakh* of *tankahs* and one hundred Arab horses.

<sup>1</sup> There are slight variations in the reading. The MSS. have دیدن او از دیدن او را معالست and دیدن او باز معالست; while the lith. ed. has دیدن او را معالست and Firishtah lith. ed. has دیدن او بار دیگر معالست.

<sup>2</sup> The word *jamdhar*, a kind of dagger, was used once before describing the attack on Khūr Muhammad Khān by one of the Rājput̃s who came as ambassador to him from the Rāju of Sirōht̃.

<sup>3</sup> The word is جهنم in both MSS., and in the corresponding passage of Firishtah; but it is عدم non-existence in the lith. ed.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah calls him Rafi'-ul-mulk, who had the title of 'Imād-ul-mulk. The Cambridge History of India, page 328, calls him 'Imād-ul-Mulk Malikji, son of Tawakkul.

on Daryā Khān, who was one of the old *amīrs* of Mālwa, and had formerly come as the ambassador to Sultān Bahādur; and advanced towards Sārangpūr. He bestowed Sārangpūr on Mallū Khān, son of Mallū Khān, who had in the time of Sultān Muẓaffar gone away from Mandū; and <sup>1</sup> had entered the service of . . . , and who in the reign of Shēr Khān had assumed the title of Qādir Shāh, and had the public prayers read and the coin struck in that country in his own name; some account of him will be written before long. And having given permission to <sup>2</sup> Ḥabīb Khān the ruler (*walī*) of Āshta to go back to Āshta, himself marched towards Bhilsa and Rāisin. Ḥabīb Khān went to Āshta, and took possession of it, after slaying a large number of the *Pūrabās*. When the Sultān arrived at Bhilsa, it became known (to him), that it was eighteen years since the time when all vestiges of Islām <sup>3</sup> had disappeared from that country; and the rites of heathenism had gained currency there. At this time spies <sup>4</sup> informed the Sultān, that when Bhūpat, the son of Silhadi,

<sup>1</sup> The words in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., as well as in the lith. ed. of Firishtah who copies the *Ṭabaqāt* closely, are ملازم شده بود without specifying the person whose servant he had become, but, according to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 358, he had from the time of the Sultān's (*i.e.*, Sultān Bahādur's) accession been in continuous attendance upon him; this explains his having become a *mulāzim*. It appears that he was a servant of the Khālji Sultāns of Mālwa, who afterwards assumed the title of Qādir Shāh, and ruled in Mandū, Ujjain, Sārangpūr and Rantambhōr.

<sup>2</sup> The readings in the MSS. are حبیب الله and حبیب خان اشته والی را . I have changed the sequence to حبیب خان والی را and in the lith. ed. حبیب خان والی را .

<sup>3</sup> The language in one MS. and in the lith. ed. is آثار اسلام ازین دیار کوچ کرد . The "marching away" of the vestiges of Islām appears to me to be inappropriate. The language in the other MS. آثار اسلام ازین دیار برطرف شده is better, and I have adopted it. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has منقطع گشته instead of برطرف شده . It appears from the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 358, that "Bhilsah which had been converted to Islām by Sultān Shams-ud-dīn of Dehli", but having been eighteen years in the possession of Silhadi, "Muhamadan law and custom had been set aside for idolatry".

<sup>4</sup> The reading in one MS. is بسمع اعلی . and in the other بسمع سلطان رسانیدند . but the lith. ed. has neither اعلی nor سلطان .

went to Chitōr, <sup>1</sup> Lakhman Sēn the brother of Silhadi had strengthened the citadel of Rūṣīn, and was making preparations for a battle, and was waiting for reinforcement from Chitōr.

<sup>2</sup> Sultān Bahādur waited at Bhilsa for three days for the erection of mosques, and other houses for pious purposes (بَقَاعِ خَيْرِ دَرَانِ), and marched from there on the 7th of Jamādī-ul-āwwal of that year and encamped at a distance of two *karōhs* from the town on the bank of the river. On the morning of Wednesday the 8th of the aforesaid month, he had the kettle-drum of victory beaten, and set up his position on the <sup>3</sup> bank of the reservoir of Rūṣīn. The army had not yet arrived, when the *Pūrabīa* Rājput̃s divided themselves into two detachments and sallied out of the fort. Sultān Bahādur with the few men that he had with him attacked them, himself <sup>4</sup> hewing down two or three men into halves from their wastes. The army of Gujrāt arrived one after another from behind, and completely routed the

<sup>1</sup> The name is لکھمن Lakhman, and لکھم سین Lakhm Sēn in different places in the MSS. and لکھمین سین Lakhmīn Sēn in the lith. ed. It is لکھمن Lakhman in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*. Col. Briggs has Lokmun Singh and the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 360, has Lakhman Sēn. The *Cambridge History of India*, page 328, has Lakhman Singh. I think Lakhman Sēn is the correct form of the name and I have adopted it.

<sup>2</sup> *Firishtah* agrees as to what Sultān Bahādur did at Bhilsa; but he does not mention his encamping on the bank of the river; and he says that he set up his بارگاہ in Rāṣīn on the 8th of the Jamādī-ul-āwwal. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 358, says the Sultān left Bhilsa on the 17th Jamādī-ul-ākhir, and proceeded by successive marches to a river two *kōs* from Rāṣīn. On the next day he pitched his camp on the bank of the tank near the fort of Rāṣīn. In spite of these contradictions about the date the *Cambridge History of India*, page 328, says that Bahādur "was attacked as he approached the town on January 26".

<sup>3</sup> Both MSS. have برایشین بارگاہ; and *Firishtah* lith. ed. has برایشین; but I prefer برحوض رایشین, which is in the lith. ed., and which agrees with the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*. M. Hidayat Ḥosain, however, has followed the MSS. in the text-edition.

<sup>4</sup> *Firishtah* agrees, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 119) says Bahadur Shah slew ten men with his own hand; and Bayley in a note, on page 358, ascribes, as in the other cases, Col. Briggs's statement to *Firishtah*.

infidels. The *Pūrabās*, <sup>1</sup> being struck by the bravery and courage of Sultān Bahādūr, took shelter in the fort. The Sultān forbade his soldiers from continuing the fight, and postponed it for the following day.

The next day he marched from that place; and fixing on the fort as the centre, distributed the batteries (among the different commanders); and commenced the construction of covered passages. Within a short time these reached a place whence they commanded the garrison. The Sultān went there himself, and leaving Rūmī Khān with the artillery, returned to his quarters. Rūmī Khān brought down two of the bastions of the fort by firing from his cannons. He also dug a mine from another side, and setting fire to it blew down some yards of the wall on that side. Silhadī seeing the weakness of the *Pūrabās*, and the great strength of the enemy sent a message to the following effect, "This slave wishes to be dignified with the nobility of Islām; and after that if he gets leave, he would <sup>2</sup> go above, and after evacuating the fort, make it over to the representative of the Bahādūr Shāhī government". The Sultān was delighted on hearing this news, and summoning Silhadī to his presence, repeated to him the words expressing the unity of God. When Silhadī accepted the faith, the Sultān gave him a special robe of honour; and sent him various kinds of food from the (royal) kitchen. He then took Silhadī with him to the foot of the fort.

Silhadī summoned Lakhman, his brother, and said to him, "As I am now included in the community of Musalmāns, Sultān Bahādūr will, either on account of a feeling of communal favour, or on account of his noble spirit, raise me to a high rank. It is fit that after surrendering the fort to the adherents of the Sultān, I

<sup>1</sup> The actual words in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. are گوش گرفته the meaning of which is not quite clear to me.

<sup>2</sup> The meaning is not quite clear. The words are بالا رفتن in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. of *Firīshṭah*; but they are omitted from the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. The meaning probably is, "Going up into the fort". It would be remembered that he was a prisoner in the Sultān Bahādūr's camp, and it appears from the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 359, that he informed the Sultān, "Having obtained the friendly offices of some of the chief nobles".

should bind the girdle of service strongly and should continue to render him service". <sup>1</sup> His brother then told him privately, that now that it is not right, according to their religion, to shed your blood, and Bhūpat is coming to their assistance, bringing the Rānā and <sup>2</sup> forty thousand men with him; something should be done, so that there might be a delay of a few days longer, in the capture of the fort. Silhadī having applauded this opinion, said to the Sultān, "Let this matter be postponed today. Tomorrow after two watches (*pās*) of the day, the fort would be evacuated, and made over to the servants of the Sultān".

Sultān Bahādur then left that place and returned to his residence; and waited for two watches of the (next) day to pass. When a moment elapsed after the appointed time, Silhadī again represented to the Sultān, "If you order, this slave would go near the fort, and having ascertained the state of things would report". Sultān Bahādur made Silhadī over to trustworthy men, and sent him to the neighbourhood of the fort. Silhadī went to the fallen bastion, and began to give advice to the people in the fort. He said, "Oh ye careless Rājputs! take note of the Sultān. He would immediately come out of the battery, and put you all to death". His object was this, that they should immediately rebuild the bastions. Lakhman gave no reply, and Silhadī returned in a state of fear. That night Lakhman

---

<sup>1</sup> According to this the plan of deceiving the Sultān first originated with Lakhman, and according to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 360, Silhadī informed the Sultān, that he was willing to become a Musalmān, as he was afraid that the Sultān's attack would be successful and all his people would be slaughtered; but according to the *Cambridge History of India*, page 328, "Silāhdī conciliated Bahādur, by perfidiously feigning to accept Islam, and thus obtained permission to meet his brother, ostensibly with the object of arranging for the surrender of the fortress, but when he and Lakhman Singh met, they agreed to await the relieving force expected from Chitor".

This is, on the face of it, somewhat contradictory. If they agreed to await the arrival of the relieving force (only), when they met, Silhadī could not have perfidiously feigned to accept Islām, and have met his brother.

<sup>2</sup> The relieving force is said to have been forty thousand in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and in Col. Briggs's translation. It is four thousand in the lith. ed. of the *Ṭabaqāt*. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 360, makes it "forty or fifty thousand picked horse and innumerable infantry".

sent two thousand *Pūrabās* with a <sup>1</sup> son of Silhadi to the station where Bhūpat was. <sup>2</sup> Silhadi's son began to fight, and the Gujrāt army having exerted themselves beyond the power of men, killed many of the Rājput̃s, and sent the head of Silhadi's son with the heads of other Rājput̃s to the Sultān.

When Silhadi received information of the death of his son, he fainted. Sultān Bahādur now became aware of the real state of things, and made Silhadi over to Burhān-ul-mulk, so that he might be kept in prison in the fort of Mandū. At this time news came, that Bhūpat was bringing the Rānā with him from Chitōr. As he knew that the Sultān had arrived *jarīda*, or with a small force, the Rānā with great audacity came along by successive marches. The Sultān said, "Although I may have only a small force with me still in accordance with the saying, that one Musalmān is equal to ten *Kāfirs*, I shall meet them". The Sultān's <sup>3</sup> wrath became violent on hearing the news of the Rānā's approach; and he immediately sent Muḥammad Khān the ruler of Burhānpūr, and 'Imād-ul-mulk Sultānī for their chastisement. When Muḥammad Khān and 'Imād-ul-mulk arrived in the town of <sup>4</sup> Sarīsa, news came that the Rānā and Bhūpat had arrived near the town of <sup>5</sup> Kahrār. Muḥammad

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. say simply *پسر سلہدی* Silhadi's son, but Firishtah has Silhadi's younger son (*پسر کوچک*); and Col. Briggs has Silhuddy's youngest son. He is called a younger son of Silhadi in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 361, and Silāhdi's youngest son in the *Cambridge History of India*, page 328.

<sup>2</sup> He was apparently intercepted by the Gujrāt army. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 361, gives a different version of the incident. According to it, "A younger son of Silhadi's made an attack upon a royal post in the town of Barsiah with two thousand horse. But the Musulmāns were victorious; and the infidel fled to his elder brother, Bhūpat".

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has *قوة غیبی* but the other MS. and the lith. ed. have *قوت غضبی*.

<sup>4</sup> The name of the town is *سرسہ* Sarīsa in one MS. and looks like *منیرمنیہ* in the other. In the lith. ed. it is *سرسہ* Sirsa. Firishtah and Col. Briggs do not give the name of the place, but say they had not gone far when they met Poorunmal. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 361, has Barsiah. The *Cambridge History of India* does not give the name of the place.

<sup>5</sup> The name is *کھرار* Kahrār and *کھرار* Khīrār in the MS. It is *کھرار* Kahrār in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has *کھرلہ* Kehrla. Col. Briggs does





and ask for the <sup>1</sup> pardon of Silhadi's offences". The Sultān said, "At present <sup>2</sup> his forces and grandeur are greater than mine. If he had submitted a petition <sup>3</sup> without fighting, <sup>4</sup> he would of course have attained his object". When those two Rājput̄s went back, and reported that they had seen the Sultān with their own eyes, the Rānū and Bhūpat in spite of all their great strength and pomp fled, making <sup>5</sup> three or four stages into one. At this time, news came that <sup>6</sup> Ulugh Khūn with thirty-six thousand horsemen, and the elephants and artillery of Gujrāt had arrived in the neighbourhood. The Sultān owing to his great bravery, did not wait for the arrival of Ulugh Khūn, but pursued the enemy for seventy *karōhs* with only the troops that

<sup>1</sup> The word is استغفای, and looks like استغفاء in the MS. It is استغفا in the lith. ed. I have retained the latter, though Firishtah has استغفای. Of course استغفای and استغفار have the same meaning; the latter has been used by M. Hidayat Hosain in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> The words are جمعیت و شوکت شما in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; and جمعیت و شوکت او in the other MS. I think the latter reading is better and I have adopted it. The Sultān was addressing the emissary, but the force and grandeur he was referring to was not theirs, but the Rānū's.

<sup>3</sup> The reading in one MS. and in the lith. ed. is جنگ کرده نه but in the other MS. it is جنگ ناکرده. This latter is the correct reading and I have adopted it. Firishtah lith. ed. also has جنگ ناکرده.

<sup>4</sup> The reading is مطلوب شما in both MSS. and in the lith. ed.; and شما also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, although it is misplaced there before مطلوب. I think او would be better, and I have adopted it; but M. Hidayat Hosain has retained شما مطلوب in the text-edition.

<sup>5</sup> Both MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have سه چهار but the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt has چهار. The making of three or four stages into one shows the rapidity of their flight.

<sup>6</sup> The name is الف خان Ulugh Khūn in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt has الف خان Alif Khūn, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 121) has Aluf Khan. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari has Alaf Khūn; but Bayley in a note, page 362, says there is the usual confusion between Alaf and Ulugh. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the arrival of the reinforcement, or the name of the commander. The number of horsemen is thirty-six thousand in the MSS. and in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari; but it is thirty thousand in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt, and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and also in Col. Briggs's history.

he had with him. The Rānā however got into Chitōr; and the Sultān leaving the punishment and castigation of the Rānā to the next year, returned to Rāīsīn; and on arriving there made the siege closer than before.

About the end of Ramaḍān, when Lakhman became hopeless of receiving reinforcement and saw destruction before his eyes, he came forward with humility and submission; and submitted a representation, that if the Sultān could summon Silhadī to his presence, and would draw the pen of forgiveness across the page of his offences, and would give him assurance of safety, this slave (that is he himself) would evacuate the fort, and <sup>1</sup> would surrender it to him. The Sultān, after much consideration, reminded himself that his object in undertaking the expedition was to free the Musalmān women from the disgrace of *kufr* (heathenism). If their (*i.e.*, Lakhman's and Silhadī's) prayer is not acceded to, it is likely, that there should be a *jauhar*, and those helpless women would all be killed. Considering all this he granted Lakhman's prayer, and summoned Silhadī to his presence from the fort of Mandū. Burhān-ul-mulk hastened from Mandū bringing Silhadī with him.

After Silhadī had come, Lakhman hastened to wait (on the Sultān); and having obtained a *farmān* granting assurance of safety (to Silhadī), went up to the fort. The Sultān detailed a body of soldiers to guard the fort. Lakhman brought down the families of the other Rājputs from the fort; but kept his own family and those of <sup>2</sup> Tāj Khān and of the principal Rājputs in the fort. He again represented to the Sultān that there were about <sup>3</sup> four hundred women, who appertained to Silhadī, and Rānī Durgāwatī, the mother of Bhūpat had a prayer, that as Silhadī had become one of the special slaves of the Sultān,

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have تسلیم مینماید, but the other MS. has تسلیم مینمایم. The lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt omits the passages from عرضداشت to بخاطر آوردند. Firishtah lith. ed. in the corresponding passage has تسلیم ملازمان مینمایم.

<sup>2</sup> It is not clear how Tāj Khān got mixed up with the Rājputs. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 121, 122) says that "Taj Khan, who had come to negotiate on the part of Lokmun, was permitted to return to the fort".

<sup>3</sup> The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 363, makes the number seven or eight hundred.

if he was allowed to come to the fort, and to take down the members of his own family from it, the latter would be protected from the taunt of being taken down by strangers. The Sultān sent Malik 'Alī Shēr with Silhadi to the fort; and when the latter arrived there, Lakhman and Tāj Khān asked of him, "What would the Sultān grant to them in exchange for the fort of Rāīsīn, and the country of Gōndwāna". Silhadi said, "At present the town of Barōda with its dependencies has been determined upon for our residence; and it is likely that the Sultān would, out of his generosity, exalt me (more)".

Rānī Durgāwatī and Lakhman and Tāj Khān said, "Although the Sultān would show us favour and kindness, still for many generations this country has been in our possession, in reality if not in name, like an empire; and now fate has ordained that we should all be (again) together. The right way of bravery is this, that we should perform *janbar* of our women and children, and should ourselves fight and be slain: and there should be no further longing left in our hearts". Silhadi was much moved by Rānī Durgāwatī's words, and assumed an attitude of rebellion and revolt. Although Malik 'Alī Shēr offered much friendly counsel, it was of no avail. (Silhadi) said in reply to Malik Shēr, "Every day one *krōr* of betel leaves, and some seers of camphor are consumed in my harem, and every day <sup>1</sup> three hundred women put on new garments. If we are killed with our women and children, what honour and glory!" He then arranged for the rite of *janbar*, and Rānī Durgāwatī, taking her <sup>2</sup> daughter-in-law, who

<sup>1</sup> The word is سیصد, but I suppose it means three hundred, and not thirteen hundred, or three thousand. The lith. ed. is defective here, having مال instead of جان and leaving out the words زن سیصد. There is a slight difference in the MSS. also; one has زن هر روز سیصد, but the other has زن دارم که سیصد. Silhadi's ideas of his own pomp and grandeur were rather curious.

<sup>2</sup> The word is عروس, which ordinarily means a bride, but it can only mean a daughter-in-law here. The lith. ed. of *Firishtah*, however, omits the word عروس, and makes Rānī Durgāwatī herself the daughter of Rānā Sānkā. The passage in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* is doubtful. It is said there according to the translation, that a daughter of the Rānī, who was the wife of Bhūpat was among the seven hundred women who were burnt. Bayley, page 365, in a note says that the word wife may be a mistake for mother. I think, however, that the account in the *Tabaqāt* is correct.

was the daughter of Rānā Sānkā, with (her) two children by the hand got into the *jaular*; and they with seven hundred beautiful women were burnt. <sup>1</sup> Sillhadi with Tāj Khān and Lakhman then armed themselves, and coming out fought with the Dakini infantry, who had gone up to the fort. When the news reached the camp, the Gujrāt army galloped up to the fort, and sent that ill-fated band to hell; while of the army of Sultān Bahādur, only four foot soldiers attained to the happiness of martyrdom.

About this time Sultān 'Ālam, the ruler of Kālpi came as a suppliant to Sultān Bahādur, against the assaults of the armies of <sup>2</sup> His Majesty Jīmāt Ashāni. Sultān Bahādur granted the forts of Rāisīn and Chandēri, and the territories of Bhilsa as a *jāgīr* to him. He also appointed Muhammad Khān, the ruler of Asir, to capture the fort of Kākāin, which in the time of Sultān Mahmūd Khafji had come into the possession of the Rānā, and himself started on an expedition to hunt elephants. He captured many elephants; and after meeting out their debts to the rebels of the <sup>3</sup> hilly country of Kānūr, made it over to <sup>4</sup> Uugh Khān. He also took possession of Islāmābād and Hūshangābād and the whole of the country of Mālwa, which was in the possession of *zamīndārs*, and granted them as *jāgīrs* to the *amīrs*

of Gujrāt, and to his own trusted adherents. When Muḥammad Khān, the ruler of Asīr, was advancing towards Kākrūn, Sultān Bahādur also arrived in that neighbourhood with great rapidity. <sup>1</sup> A man of the name of Rām, who was the governor of the place on behalf of the Rānā, evacuated it, and fled. Sultān Bahādur occupied himself there for four days in festive assembly and entertainment; and granted rewards and favours to each one of the men who were near his person. He then sent 'Imād-ul-mulk and Ikhtiyār Khān, who were among his great nobles, to capture the fort of <sup>2</sup> Mandisōr; and himself went to Mandū. The governor of Mandisōr, who was an officer of the Rānā evacuated it <sup>3</sup> and fled; and in the course of one month the forts of Kākrūn and Mandisōr came into the Sultān's possession.

The Sultān advanced from Mandū to Chāmpānīr. Information came at the latter place, that the <sup>4</sup> *firangīs* had come to the port of

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. have رام نامی, while the lith. ed. has رام نام. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has رام جی نامی. The name is not given either by Col. Briggs or in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari or in the Cambridge History of India. It would appear from Col. Briggs and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari that Muḥamad Shāh had not yet succeeded in capturing Gāgrūn, but when Sultān Bahādar appeared, the place was evacuated (Bayley, pp. 367, 368).

<sup>2</sup> The name is دانتور Dantūr, and دستور Dastūr in the MSS.; and looks like دمطور Damtūr in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has راسور Rasūr, and Col. Briggs has Runtunbhora (vol. IV, p. 123). The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 368, and the Cambridge History of India have Mandisōr or Mandasor, which I have adopted.

<sup>3</sup> There is some difference in the readings. One MS. has قلعه را خالی گذاشته گر بخت. The other has the same, but inserts باقر between گذاشته and گر بخت. The lith. ed. has خالی کرده باشند گر بخت. Firishtah lith. ed. has the same reading as the first MS., and I have adopted it.

<sup>4</sup> With reference to this, see the footnote in Col. Briggs, vol. IV, page 123, from which it appears that according to Faria-e-Sonza (tome I, part iv, chapter iv) it was one of the greatest efforts made by the Portuguese, but it appears to have failed entirely. The fleet consisted of four hundred vessels, on which were embarked three thousand six hundred European soldiers and ten thousand native soldiers, besides seamen and Lascars. The Mahomedans under Moostufa Khan the Governor of Diū or Dip so completely repulsed the attack that the Portuguese had to return to Goa. Bayley also in a note, on page 369, says that it was a very important struggle, and he hoped to discuss it more

Dīp, and had raised the standard of power. The Sultān advanced towards Dīp and when he arrived in its neighbourhood, (he heard) that the *firangīs* had fled; and a great cannon, which exceeded in size all other cannon in India, came into his possession. The Sultān had it conveyed to Chāmpānīr by means of a special machine. He then determined to seize Chitōr, and marched from Dīp to Kanbāyet and from there to Aḥmadābād. Here he went on pilgrimage to the tombs of the holy Shaikh̄s and of his great ancestors. He collected troops, and with the artillery of Dīp and Gujrāt advanced towards Chitōr. <sup>1</sup> At this time Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā fled from the court of His Majesty Humāyūn Bādshāh, and came as a suppliant to the Sultān. When the latter arrived at Chitōr, the Rānā shut himself up in the fort; and the period of the siege was prolonged to three months. On many occasions brave men prepared for combat came out from the two armies, and performed gallant deeds. On most of these occasions victory and triumph fell to the lot of the Gujrātīs. In the end the Rānā came forward with humility, and paid a large subsidy and making the crown and the <sup>2</sup> jewelled belt, which he had taken from Sultān Maḥmūd Kḥalji the ruler of Mālwa, and some horses and elephants, the ransom of his life, turned the Sultān back to Gujrāt.

This victory and the coming of Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā, and the gathering together of the descendants of Sultān Bahlūl Lūdī in his service became the cause of the increase of Sultān Bahādur's pride. It also became the cause, that set on move the chain of hostility with His Majesty Muḥammad Humāyūn Bādshāh. In order to carry out this intention, he conferred favours on Tātār Kḥān, son of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, son of Sultān Bahlūl Lūdī, who was distinguished above

fully in an appendix on Portuguese affairs in his second volume. The Cambridge History of India, page 329, only mentions Bahādur's visit to Diū, and says nothing whatever about the attack by the Portuguese.

<sup>1</sup> Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā was a prisoner in the fort of Bīāna, and fled from there in the year 940 A.H.

<sup>2</sup> About this belt see Note on page 124 of Col. Briggs's History, vol. IV, from which it appears that it was sent with Bahādur Shah's family to Medina; and it eventually found its way in the shape of a present to the Grand Seigneur, Soliman the Magnificent.



Humāyūn Bādshāh to Sultān Bahādur, to the effect that even if he does not send Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā to his presence, he should at least expel him from his own dominions. Sultān Bahādur on account of his great pride and self glorification did not send a satisfactory reply. In addition to this Tātār Khān attacked Blāna and seized it. His Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī sent Hindāl Mirzā to crush him. When the Mirzā arrived in the neighbourhood of Blāna, the men who had gathered round Tātār Khān dispersed; and not more than two thousand horsemen remained with him. Owing to his great shame and remorse, that he had spent such a large sum of money upon his faithless soldiers, he could not go and wait on the Sultān and ask him for further help. Having no alternative left, he decided on a battle; and, when the two armies met, he made an onslaught on the centre of Mirzā Hindāl's army: and was, with the three hundred men who were with him, slain: and the fort of Blāna came into the possession of Mirzā, the royal officer.

His Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī took this victory to be a good omen, and advanced to crush Sultān Bahādur. It so happened that the latter had at this time again advanced to seize the fort of Chitōr, with a large army, and all the appliances for the capture of fort. When the news of the defeat and death of Tātār Khān, and of the advance of His Majesty (Humāyūn) reached him at the foot of the fort of Chitōr, he became extremely anxious, and had a conference as to the course he should adopt. The opinion of most of the *amīrs* was to the effect, that he should raise the siege of Chitōr, and advance to meet Humāyūn; but <sup>1</sup> Šadr Khān, who was the greatest of his nobles, submitted, "We are besieging the *Kāfir*; if a Bādshāh of the Musalmāns comes to attack us, he would be supporting and helping the *Kāfir*; and <sup>2</sup> such an act would be talked about among Musalmāns

---

A messenger on a swift horse was at once sent to intercept the letter but he was unable to do so; and the letter reached Humāyūn, and was the direct cause of the war between the two sovereigns.

<sup>1</sup> It is curious that although he is called the *بزرگترین امرا*, he has never been mentioned before. Firishtah lith. ed. has by mistake *حیدر خان*, Hindar Khān. The Cambridge History of India, page 330, has "Sadr Khan, one of his officers".

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has by mistake *این امر روز تا قیامت*.





Bahādur, submitted that cannon and muskets <sup>1</sup> do not come into use in a battle: and the artillery, which has come into the possession of this government is such, that it is not known whether any sovereign except the *Qaiṣar* of *Rūm* (the Sultān of Turkey) has anything like it. On this account it is advisable that a <sup>2</sup> ditch should be dug around the army, and skirmishes should be fought every day, and bold warriors of the Mughal army would come and deliver attacks all round the camp, and would be killed by the discharges of cannon and the muskets.

Sultān Bahādur approved of this plan and a ditch was dug round the camp. At this time Sultān 'Ālām Kūlpīwāl, on whom Sultān Bahādur had conferred Rāṣid and Chaudhī and that *ṣūba* as *jāgīrs*, came with a large army, and joined the Gujrāt camp. For two months the two armies sat face to face; and <sup>3</sup> the Mughal troops raided round the camp, and shut up the way of the ingress and egress of grain. After some days had elapsed in this way, a <sup>4</sup> great scarcity made its

commence also within inverted commas in Bayley's history, from which it would appear that the writer had seen the letter and was quoting from it; but unfortunately no reference has been given.

<sup>1</sup> The *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* (Denison Ross, p. 14), however, says something which is slightly different, and which if correct makes the advice less absurd. It says what Rūmī Khān said was *ما توپ و تفنگ بسیار داریم آنها را کار نفرمایم و سپاه خود را* and further on *و بتدریج هر روز طرح جنگ انداخته - مغولان را روی و بکشتن دهم* . As a matter of fact, however, much use does not appear to have been made of the cannon and muskets.

<sup>2</sup> The *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* (p. 14) says *آرامه کنند*. Sir Denison Ross, the editor of the *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt*, says *araba* means "an enclosed camp or *zariba*", although in the dictionary it only means a cart or wagon.

<sup>3</sup> Firishah's account explains better, how it was that the Mughal army suffered such small loss from the cannon and muskets of the Gujrātis, and was still able to blockade the camp.

<sup>4</sup> A graphic, but what appears to me, to be a somewhat exaggerated account of this scarcity is given in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 384. On the same and also on the next page a further instance is given of Rūmī Khān's treachery. It appears that a leader of *Banjārahs* came and told Sultān Bahādur that he had brought a million bullock-loads of grain, but could not bring them into the camp for fear of the Moghals. Sultān Bahādur accordingly sent out five thousand men secretly at night to escort the *Banjārahs*; but Rūmī Khān wrote and informed Humāyūn, and the Gujrātī escort was defeated, and the grain was intercepted and taken into the Moghal camp.

appearance in the Gujrāt army; and all the fodder that was in the neighbourhood was entirely exhausted. Owing to the attacks of the Mughals, no one had the power, that he should go to a distance from the camp and bring grain and fodder. Sultān Bahādur saw that his remaining there any longer would result in his capture. Therefore one night he came out from behind his pavilion and, with five of his trusted *amīrs*, one of whom was the governor of Burhānpūr and another <sup>1</sup> Mallū Qādir Khān, governor of Mālwa, <sup>2</sup> fled towards Mandū. When his army came to know of his flight, <sup>3</sup> each man fled in a (different) direction.

His Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī Humāyūn Bādshāh <sup>4</sup> pursued (Sultān Bahādur) to the foot of the fort of Mandū, and on the way many men were killed. Sultān Bahādur shut himself up in Mandū; and after some time <sup>5</sup> Hindū Bēg Qūlchīn and a number of other Mughal *amīrs* got into the fort from the <sup>6</sup> bastion of the seven hundred steps. Sultān

<sup>1</sup> One MS. omits Qādir.

<sup>2</sup> A somewhat different account of the circumstances attending and immediately proceeding Sultān Bahādur's flight is given in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, pp. 385. 386. The date of the flight is given as the 20th Ramazān, 941 A.H., 25th March, 1535 A.D. The Cambridge History of India, page 331. gives 25th April, 1535, as the date of the flight. The *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* (pp. 17, 18) has a rather incoherent account of Sultān Bahādur's proceedings immediately before his flight.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have *هر کدام* but the other MS. has *هر کدامی*; I have adopted the former.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have *تعقب فرموده در راه*; the other MSS. have *تعقب فرمود و در راه*. I have adopted the latter reading.

<sup>5</sup> The names are *مندو بیگ قوچین* and *مندو بیگ قوچین* in the MSS. In the lith. ed. it is *عمارون بیگ قوچینی*, which is incorrect. In the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* it is Hindū Bēg without any suffix. The name does not appear to be mentioned in the *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt*, the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* or the Cambridge History of India.

<sup>6</sup> The words are *از مرجل مقتصد زینه* in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. *Firishtah* lith. ed. has incorrectly *یا مقتصد نفر*, i.e., with seven hundred men; and Col. Briggs says that "Hindoo Beg and seven hundred Moguls who entered the fort at night along with his followers". The *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* (p. 17) says the Mughals got into the fort *طرف راه مقتصد زینه*, i.e., from the direction of the path of the seven hundred steps. The Cambridge History of India (p. 331) says, "A division escalated the walls of the fort at night". The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*

Bahādur was asleep when there was a great noise; and the Gujrātīs in great dismay took the path of flight. Sultān Bahādur with five or six horsemen went away in the direction of Chāmpānīr. Šadr Khān and Sultān 'Ālām, governor of Rāīsīn and that *šūba*, took shelter in the citadel of <sup>1</sup> Sūnkar; and after two days they asked for assurances of their lives being spared, and waited on Jinnat Āshīānī. Šadr Khān was taken into the latter's service; but Sultān 'Ālām, as he had been guilty of improper behaviour, had, by order of Humāyūn, his sinews cut off (*i.e.*, he was hamstrung). Sultān Bahādur sent the treasure and jewels which he had at Chāmpānīr to the port of Dīp, and himself went to Kanbāyet. When His Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī in pursuit of him arrived at the foot of the fort of Chāmpānīr he marched from there and proceeded towards Kanbāyet on <sup>2</sup> wings of speed. Sultān Bahādur took <sup>3</sup> fresh, strong horses and went on to the port of Dīp. His Majesty Humāyūn arrived at Kanbāyet the very day that Bahādur started for Dīp, and leaving Kanbāyet he <sup>4</sup> took possession of Chāmpānīr. Ikhtiyār Khān Gujrāti, the governor of the fort, occupied himself in defending it, but his Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī seized it by a <sup>5</sup> plan which has been described in the narrative of his history. Ikhtiyār Khān took shelter in the citadel of the fort, which was called Mīliā; and in the end after praying for quarter, acquired the honour of serving His Majesty. As he was distinguished by great excellence and accomplishments above all the other *amīrs* of Gujrāt, he was enlisted among the courtiers of Humāyūn's special *majlis*.

---

(Bayley, p. 387) ascribes the capture of Mandū to the treachery of Rūmī Khān. It says that the latter wrote to Bhūpat son of Silhadī, who had charge of one of the gates, to revenge the wrongs of his family by throwing it open, and the Moghals entered by it.

<sup>1</sup> Written as سونگر and سونگر in the MSS., and سونگر in the lith. ed.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have بجهاد تعجيل but the other MS. has بر سبيل تعجيل. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has adopted بجهاد تعجيل in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> The actual words are اسپان تازه زور in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt has by mistake روز اسپان تازه.

<sup>4</sup> The MSS. have قبل فرمودند, and قبل کردند. The lith. ed. has قبل کرد. I have adopted قبل کردند.

<sup>5</sup> See *ante*, Translation, vol. II, pp. 54 and 55. See also note 55, page 353.



After that His Majesty encamped in front of Aḥmadābād; and <sup>1</sup> made over the government of that place to Mirzā 'Askarī, and Pattan Gujrāt to Yādgar Nāṣir Mirzā, and Bahrōj to Qāsim Ḥusain Sultān and <sup>2</sup> Barōda to Hindū Bēg Qūlchīn, and Chāmpānir to Tardī Bēg Khān, and himself went to <sup>3</sup> Burhānpūr. From there he went to Mandū.

<sup>4</sup> At this time, Khān Jahān Shīrāzī who was one of the *amīrs* of Sultān Bahādur, collected an army and took possession of Nausārī; and Rūmī Khān having joined him from the port of Sōrath, they marched towards Bahrōj. Qāsim Ḥusain Sultān finding that he was not strong enough to meet them went to Tardī Bēg Khān at Chāmpānir; and disturbances and rebellion commenced over the whole of Gujrāt. At this time Ghadanfar who was one of the *amīrs* of Mirzā 'Askarī fled and went to Sultān Bahādur, and incited him to advance to Aḥmadābād. The details of this <sup>5</sup> brief statement have been narrated in their proper place. All the *amīrs* <sup>6</sup> except Tardī Bēg Khān now

---

would appear that 'Imād-ul-mulk was himself slain, though this is not expressly stated anywhere else. The battle and most of the incidents narrated here were narrated previously in the history of Humāyūn's reign; see translation, vol. II, p. 57. A rather long account of the battle with some irrelevant matter is given in the *Tārikh-i-Gujarāt* (p. 27); but the purport of it agrees with that given in the *Akbar-nāma*.

<sup>1</sup> This distribution of governments has already been mentioned in the history of Humāyūn's reign (translation, vol. II, p. 58).

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have برودرة, but I have as before adopted the present spelling Barōda, but M. Hidayat Ḥosain has retained برودرة Barōdra in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 333, says Humāyūn marched to Burhānpur. Muhammad Shāh or Muhammad Khān Āsirī wrote to him to spare his little kingdom, and invited the other rulers of the Deccan to form a league for their mutual defence; but Humāyūn's operations were confined to a military promenade through Khāndesh.

<sup>4</sup> See *ante*, translation, vol. II, page 58. The conduct of Rūmī Khān contradicts, to some extent, the accounts given in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* of his treachery against Sultān Bahādur. The *Tārikh-i-Gujarāt* (p. 29) describes in some detail, how Humāyūn's governors vacated or were made to vacate their various districts or fiefs.

<sup>5</sup> See *ante*, translation, vol. II, page 59. The *Tārikh-i-Gujarāt* does not appear to mention the incident.

<sup>6</sup> Both MSS. have بغیر از تردی بیگ خان; but the lith. ed. has بغیر از تردی بیگ خان.

assembled in Aḥmadābād. Sultān Bahādur advanced into <sup>1</sup> Gujrāt. 'Askarī Mirzā and Yādgar Nāsir Mirzā and all the *amīrs* agreed among themselves, that as it was difficult or in fact impossible to meet and withstand him, and as Jinnat Āshīānī was in Mandū, it would be most advisable to seize the treasure which was in Chāmpānīr, and advance towards Āgra; and having taken possession of those districts, <sup>2</sup> read the public prayer in the name of Mirzā 'Askarī. At the same time the rank of *vazārat* should belong to Hindū Bēg, and the other *Mirzās* should go and take possession of any province which they might think of. On this decision they relinquished the country of Gujrāt for nothing; Gujrāt which had been acquired with so much trouble and hardship. They advanced towards Chāmpānīr. Tardī Bēg Khān having obtained information of the wicked design of the *Mirzās* and the other nobles endeavoured to strengthen the fort.

<sup>3</sup> The *amīrs* started from Chāmpānīr in the direction of Mālwa; and commenced to tread along the desert of disgrace and shameless-

<sup>1</sup> He was at Dip, which was in Sōrath.

<sup>2</sup> The Cambridge History of India, page 333, says, " 'Askarī Mirzā at Aḥmadābād was meditating his own proclamation as King of Gujarāt". This appears to me to be totally incorrect. 'Askarī Mirzā and all the other Mughal nobles were giving up the possession of Gujrāt, and were marching towards Āgra. He could not, therefore, think of proclaiming himself as the king of Gujrāt. He wanted to proclaim himself as *Bādshāh* of Dehlī. The Cambridge History of India further goes on to say that Mirzā 'Askarī and others besieged Tardī Beg at Chāmpāner. This is scarcely correct. Neither the *Ṭabaqāt* nor *Firishtah* says so; and even the *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* which gives, on page 31, the negotiations between the *Mirzās* and Tardī Bēg Khān does not say so. The *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* which has been edited by Sir Denison Ross is slightly incoherent; for instance, the sentence beginning with *درین ایام* and ending with *بچانپانیر است*, on the page referred to is incomplete. The punctuation is peculiar. There are two marks, a \* and a —; and it is not clear what they exactly represent; but whether the sentence referred to ends with *بچانپانیر است* where there is the dash mark or with *گرفتن تر کرده اند*, where there is the star mark; there is no verb to *سلطان بهادر*; and if the sentence begins and ends with the star mark then it curiously jumbles up two totally unconnected matters.

<sup>3</sup> Both the MSS. have no nominative to the verb *شروع کردنی*, but the lith. ed. had *امرا*, and *Firishtah* in the corresponding passage has *میرزایان*. I have adopted the reading of the lith. ed.

ness. When Sultān Bahādur found Gujrāt unguarded, he advanced towards Chāmpānīr to crush Tardī Bēg Khān. The latter took with him such portion of the treasure of Chāmpānīr as he could, and commenced to retrace his steps to Āgra. Sultān Bahādur halted at Chāmpānīr for ten days, and occupied himself in arranging the affairs of that neighbourhood. As, in the times of the power of Jinnat Āshīānī, he had owing to his great distress and weakness asked for help from the *fīrangīs*, he knew for certain that they would come; and knowing that the ports of Gujrāt were unguarded, and being afraid that they should come under the possession of the *fīrangīs*, he started from Chāmpānīr, and advanced towards Sōrath and Junāgarh, so that, on the arrival of the *fīrangīs*, he might turn them back by any means that might be possible. <sup>1</sup> He had been engaged for some days in travelling about and hunting, when news came that five or

---

<sup>1</sup> The circumstances attending Sultān Bahādur's death are given in the different histories in a way which mainly agrees with the text. Firishtah copies it almost word for word. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 132-141) reduces the number of Europeans to four or five thousand but otherwise agrees. He, however, gives extracts from Fariah-e-Souza's History of the Portuguese in Asia, and also from the Mirut Iskundry, to give the two opposite versions of the incidents connected with Sultan Bahadur's death. The Portuguese version shows that Nuno de Cunha, who commanded at Goa, but who having been informed by Emanuel de Souza, who commanded at Diū, had come to the latter place, were both convinced that Badur intended to seize, and put them to death, and to secure the fort of Diū which he, when hard pressed by Humāyūn had given them permission to build; and they were also contriving to seize him, put him to death. As to the actual occurrence, the Portuguese version is that Emanuel de Souza was going to invite the king to the fort . . . . He came up with the king's barge, and made the offer (invitation?) by means of Rume Cham (رومی خان). The latter cautioned the king, but he slighted the warning, and invited Emanuel de Souza to come into his barge. The latter when doing so fell into the sea, but was pulled up, and taken to the king. At the same time another Portuguese barge came up with some gentlemen on board, who seeing Emanuel de Souza hastily got into the king's barge. The king suspecting their sudden coming on board, and remembering the caution given by Rume Cham ordered his officers to kill Emanuel de Souza. James de Mesquita understanding it, flew at and wounded the king. Emanuel de Souza was killed and there was a bloody fray. Finally Badur attempted to escape by swimming, but he was in danger of drowning. Then Tristan de Payva de Santarem reached out an oar to him to take him on board,



six thousand *ḥirangīs* had arrived in *gharābs*. When they arrived at the port of Dīp, and heard of the restoration of Sultān Bahādur to power, and of the return of His Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī, they became ashamed and repentant about their coming. They agreed among themselves, that by any deception that might be possible they should take possession of Dīp. Their chief, in accordance with this plan, feigned illness and spread a report about it. His object was that he might not have an interview with Sultān Bahādur. The latter sent men one after another to summon him, and got (the same) reply. In the end thinking that the *ḥirangīs* were afraid of him he got into a barge, with a small number of men, to go and reassure them. The *ḥirangīs* finding the opportunity which they had been seeking, planned to act treacherously. The Sultān perceiving this, tried to get back into his barge. At the time when he was stepping into it, from the *gharāb* of the *ḥirangīs*, the latter separated the two vessels; and the Sultān being unable to get into his own barge fell into the sea, and having sunk once, put his head out of the water. At this time one of the *ḥirangīs* struck him with a spear and drowned him. The Gujrāt army returned without any delay to Aḥmadābād; and the

---

when a soldier struck him across the face with a halbert, and so others, till he was killed.

The Mirrāt Iskandry's account is different. According to it the Portuguese built a fort at Dīū after obtaining Bahadur Shah's permission to build an enclosure on a *hide* of land, but they cut the cow hide into narrow strips and enclosed a large area on which they built a strong fort. When Bahadur was restored to power, he began to think of a stratagem to expel them and the Portuguese becoming aware of his intention became suspicious. When he came to the neighbourhood of Dīū, he sent one Noor Mahomed Khuleel to the Portuguese chief with instructions to persuade the latter to come and visit the king. The envoy when drinking with the Portuguese chief divulged the king's real intentions to the latter. The Portuguese chief told him that he was unable to go on account of his indisposition. The king determined to go on board the Portuguese chief's barge on the plea of inquiring about his health, but really with the object of allaying his suspicions. When he got on board, the Portuguese, according to a pre-conceived plan, cut him and his companions down. The date of the murder is given as 3rd Rumzan, 943 A.H., 14th February, 1537 A.D.

The Cambridge History of India, page 334, gives 13th February, 1537, as the date of Sultān Bahādur's death.

port of Dīp came into the possession of the *firangīs*. This event happened in the month of Ramaḍān, in the year 943 A.H.

The period of Sulṭān Bahādur's reign was <sup>1</sup> eleven years and nine months.

<sup>2</sup> A NARRATIVE OF MIRĀN MUHAMMAD SHĀH, RULER OF ASĪR AND BURHĀNPŪR.

When Sulṭān Bahādur packed up the goods of existence, his mother Makhdūma-i-Jahān and the *amīrs*, who had been attending on his stirrups, retraced their steps from Dīp to Aḥmadābād. On the way intelligence reached them, that Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā, whom Sulṭān Bahādur had, in the time of the disturbances, sent towards Dehlī and Lāhōre, that he might create disturbances in northern India, and cause dissensions in the Chaghtāi army had returned from the neighbourhood of Lāhōre, and had arrived at Aḥmadābād. Immediately on hearing of the martyrdom of Sulṭān Bahādur, he commenced weeping and making much lamentation, and changed his dress, *i.e.*, put on mourning; and started towards Dīp in order to offer his condolence. When he joined the camp, Makhdūma-i-Jahān, as far as lay in her power, sent the necessary articles for his entertainment, and made him put off his mourning garb.

<sup>3</sup> But that fortunate Mirzā made his inquiries into the circumstances

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has only eleven years, but the other MSS. and the lith. ed. have eleven years and nine months.

<sup>2</sup> The heading is partly obliterated in one MS. In the other it is as I have it in the text. The lith. ed. has *میران محمد شاه* between *حکومت* and *ذکر*, and substitutes *حاکم والی* for *حاکم*.

<sup>3</sup> The *Ṭabaqāt* and *Firishtah* confine themselves to the above narrative of Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā's misdeeds; but the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, and the *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* say that he attempted to usurp the throne of Gujarāt. Their accounts are, however, different. According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 400, he went to the apartments of the Sultān's wives, and after offering many condolences, he urged that they should adopt him as a son and help him. The ladies said that they never interfered in politics; and the question of the Sultān's successor should be settled by the ministers. When his pretensions became known, the *amīrs* decided that the task of putting him down must have precedence of all other matters; and should be entrusted to 'Imād-ul-Mulk. There was some opposition to the latter part of the plan by Afzal Khān. 'Imād-ul-Mulk, however, started with a large army for Sōrath; and when he reached

of the Sultān's mother, and showed his kindness towards her, in this (strange) way, that at the time of his departure he made an attack on the treasury, and carried away from it, according to a reputed statement, seven hundred chests of gold, and went away to a distance; and twelve thousand horsemen, Mughals and Hindūstānīs collected round him.

The *amīrs* of Gujrāt became perturbed on beholding this new disturbance, and took counsel with one another, about the choice of a *bādshāh*. As Sultān Bahādur had repeatedly expressed his intention of making Mīrān Muḥammad Shāh, who was his nephew (sister's son), his heir, <sup>1</sup> everyone agreed to select him as the Sultān, and had

the neighbourhood of U'nah the Mīrzā came out and bravely offered battle; but was defeated and was obliged to take refuge in exile.

The *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* (pp. 36-39) says that Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā hastened to Dīb, that he might take his revenge of Sultān Bahādur's murder from the *frangīs*. He then seized the treasure which was being brought from Dīb, and took possession of it; and, according to the account which is generally believed, there were nine hundred chests of gold. He also had the public prayer read in his own name at Dīb. When this news reached Aḥmadābād, the *amīrs* determined to vacate Aḥmadābād, and go away to different places. At this juncture 'Imād-ul-mulk came to the *majlis* and demanded of Afḡal Khān and Ikhtiyār Khān, who were the *rakīls* of the Sultān, what they intended to do. On hearing their views he reproached them that they could think of lowering their heads before Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā. They say that the people of Gujarāt were too weak to meet the army, which Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā had raised with the treasure he had robbed. He exhorted them to remain quietly at Aḥmadābād and allow him to deal with Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā. They agreed. He had at that time only nine horsemen with him. He started from Aḥmadābād, and halted at 'Uṭhmānpūr, and made a proclamation of the grant of *jāgīr*, etc., to the soldiers. Within one month he had forty thousand horsemen. He then marched against Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā. The latter however took shelter in an entrenchment. His *rakīl*, and the commander of this army Ḥisām-ud-dīn Mīrak, son of Mīr Khālifa, offered battle; and on the 3rd day when he was fighting. Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā escaped from the entrenchment, and fled to Sind.

The Cambridge History of India, pp. 334, 335, says that Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā claimed the throne of Gujarāt on the ground that Sultān Bahādur's mother had adopted him but says nothing further about what happened to him later.

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah agrees generally, and so does the *Mīrāt-i-Sikandari*. The *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt*, however, says that while the *amīrs* were engaged in discussing

the *Khutba* read and the *sikka* struck in his name in his absence. They sent swift messengers to bring him. They also nominated 1 'Imād-ul-mulk with a large army for the destruction of Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā. The 2 latter fought with him and was defeated.

Mirān Muḥammad Shāh, whom Sultān Bahādur had sent as far as Mālwa in pursuit of the Chaghtāi army, died of natural causes, a month and half after the *Khutba* had been read in his name.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN MAHMUD SHĀH, SON OF LATIF KHĀN, SON  
OF MUZAFFAR SHĀH.



of Maḥmūd Shāh. <sup>1</sup> Ikhtiyār Khān Gujrātī, who had gone to Burhānpūr to bring him, became all-powerful; and the reins of the affairs of the kingdom <sup>2</sup> came into his grasp of power.

<sup>3</sup> After a few months, in the year 945 A.H. the *amīrs* fell out amongst themselves. Daryā Khān and 'Imād-ul-mulk united together and put Ikhtiyār Khān to death. 'Imād-ul-mulk became *Amīr-ul-ūmarā*, and Daryā Khān, the *vazīr*. <sup>4</sup> At the end of that year enmity appeared between them also. Daryā Khān took Sultān Maḥmūd out of the city on the pretext of a hunting excursion; and went away in the direction of Chāmpānūr. When 'Imād-ul-mulk

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah also says that it was Ikhtiyār Khān who went to Burhānpūr: but see note 1, page 384, from which it would appear that it was his brother Muqbil Khān who went. Col. Briggs also says that it was Mokbil Khan.

<sup>2</sup> The word *قوار* is omitted in one MS.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah agrees generally but he calls Daryā Khān, Daryā Khān Ghūrī; and he calls 'Imād-ul-mulk's *jāgīr*, Sirangūōn and Sūrat. Col. Briggs does not say that 'Imād-ul-mulk and Daryā Khān combined together, and put Ikhtiyār Khān to death; but he says Yekhtiar Khan lost his life in an affray. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, pages 407, 408, gives a circumstantial account of how Ikhtiyār Khān was killed. According to it, the young Sultān was kept practically in confinement by Ikhtiyār Khān, Mukbil Khan and the latter's son Lād Khan. He was dissatisfied, but feigned to be totally indifferent. Lād Khan one day proposed to him that if he would give the word, he would so manage that Dariū Khan and 'Imād-ul-Mulk would go to retire behind the veil of death. Tho Sultān at once rode to the house of 'Imād-ul-Mulk; and the latter and Dariū Khān went to the palace; and Ikhtiyār Khān, Mukbil Khān and Lād Khan were all hanged in front of the audience hall; Ikhtiyār Khān protesting his innocence to the last moment.

The account given in the *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* (pp. 41, 42) is not very clear; but according to it there was a quarrel between Ikhtiyār Khān and 'Imād-ul-mulk and Daryā Khān, because the young Sultān was kept in charge of Ikhtiyār Khān's brother Muqbil Khān. 'Imād-ul-mulk and Daryā Khān charged Ikhtiyār Khān with disloyalty to the Sultān; and with conspiring with the ruler of Burhānpūr. He stoutly denied it; but they appeared to have wrung his neck; and buried his body in the garden of the palace where the quarrel took place.

The Cambridge History of India, page 345, seems partially to follow this version.

<sup>4</sup> As to the quarrel between 'Imād-ul-mulk and Daryā Khān, all the histories appear to agree. It appears that most of the nobles were on the side of Daryā Khān; and 'Imād-ul-mulk was deserted by them and by the army he had collected; and so had to give in.

became aware of these happenings, he began at once to collect his forces; and opening his hands for lavish gifts, got an immense army together, and advanced towards Chāmpānīr. After two or three months most of the Gujrātī soldiers, who had obtained large sums of money from him, separated from him and united with the Sultān. 'Imād-ul-mulk in his distress agreed to an amicable settlement, and it was settled that 'Imād-ul-mulk should go away to Jhālāwār, and some *parganas* of Sōrath which were in his *jāgīr*; and the Sultān should return to his capital of Aḥmadābād.

Again in the year 949 A.H. Daryā Khān advanced towards the country of Sōrath, taking Sultān Maḥmūd and a well-equipped army with him, in order to extirpate 'Imād-ul-mulk. The latter came forward to meet him; but after a battle fled and went as a suppliant to Mīrān Mubārak Shāh, ruler of Asīr and Burhānpūr. Sultān Maḥmūd advanced towards Burhānpūr in pursuit of him. Mīrān Mubārak Shāh assembled his army and came forward to aid 'Imād-ul-mulk. He encountered the Gujrāt army in the battlefield, but was defeated. 'Imād-ul-mulk then fled from Burhānpūr, and took shelter with Qādir Shāh, the ruler of Mālwa. <sup>1</sup> Mīrān Mubārak Shāh sought the intervention of the great men of the age, and coming in by the door of peace rendered homage to Sultān Maḥmūd. Daryā Khān acquired much power and strength owing to the departure of 'Imād-ul-mulk, and took upon himself the performance of all matters and affairs of the government and revenue administration; and allowed no one else to interfere in them. Gradually things came to such a pass that he made Sultān Maḥmūd a puppet and acted himself as the *bādshāh*. Then one night, in concert with <sup>2</sup> Jarjīū, a pigeon fancier, the Sultān

<sup>1</sup> The reason for Mīrān Mubārak Shāh's asking for peace, and doing homage to Sultān Maḥmūd is explained by Firīshṭah, who says سلطان محمود شاه چون در خاندیش فروکشی کرده بتاخت و تاراج مشغول گشت *i.e.*, Sultān Maḥmūd invaded Khāndēsh, and occupied himself in plundering and ravaging (the country).

<sup>2</sup> The name is given as جرجیو کبوتر and جرسو کبوتر in the MSS., and جرجیو کبوتر in the lith. ed. It is جرجیو کبوتر in the lith. ed. of Firīshṭah. The name does not appear to be mentioned in the Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt. In the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 416, the man is called Jarjī the bird catcher; and the Cambridge History of India, page 337, has Chīrjī a fowler. I have adopted Jarjīū, a pigeon fancier. The way in which the Sultān fled

came out of the citadel of the fort of Aḥmadābād; and went to 'Ālam Khān Lūdī, who held Dūlqa and Dandūqa as his *jāgīr*.

<sup>1</sup> 'Ālam Khān Lūdī considering the advent of the Sultān a great honour, collected his troops; and four thousand horsemen gathered round him. Daryā Khān brought forward a <sup>2</sup> boy of unknown descent, and gave him the title of Sultān Muzaḥfar Shāh; and collected the army of Gujrāt. He brought the commanders of the army over to his side by promising to increase their *jāgīrs* and add to their titles; and advanced towards Dūlqa. 'Ālam Khān came forward, and met him, and <sup>3</sup> a great battle raged between the two armies. At the first onset, however, 'Ālam Khān defeated the vanguard of Daryā Khān's army; and advancing into his special detachment fought with great gallantry and courage. But when he came out of the battlefield there

to 'Ālam Khān is described in almost identical words in the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 416, gives a circumstantial account which differs in various particulars from that in the Ṭabaqāt. The Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt gives some account of what happened before the flight, but does not say anything about the flight itself. The Cambridge History of India's account is somewhat different. *چرجو* in the text-edition.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has *معزم عالم خان* but the other MS. and the lith. ed. have *عالم خان لودی*. Firishtah also has *عالم خان لودی* and I have adopted it.

<sup>2</sup> *طفل مجهول النسب* is the description in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has *مجهول النسب*. The Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt has *از قبيلة سلطان احمد بانى احمد آباد*; and the Mirāt-i-Sikandari, Bayley, page 417, describes the boy as a descendant of Sultan Ahmad, the founder of Aḥmadābād. The Cambridge History of India calls him a child of obscure origin. It appears that Daryā Khān was willing to give up his position; and in fact sent in his resignation; but was overruled by Fattūjī Muhāfiz Khān, who was a relation of his, and a man of much experience; and then he produced the pretender, and marched out to meet 'Ālam Khān and Sultān Mahmūd (p. 338).

<sup>3</sup> The account of the battle as given in the Mirāt-i-Sikandari is entirely different. According to it Dariā Khān was victorious, and took possession of Dhōlkah; and both the Sultān and 'Ālam Khān fled. After their defeat, however, large bodies of troops joined him, and Dariā Khān found his army dwindling away. He attempted to enter Aḥmadābād, but the people shut the gate in his face, and attacked him with arrows and musket fire. Then the Sultān and 'Ālam Khān advanced to Aḥmadābād. Dariā Khān sent his family and treasures to Chāmpānīr; and went himself to Burhānpūr to bring Mīrūn Mubārak Shāh as his ally.



were no more than five horsemen with him, and he could not find Sultān Maḥmūd, whom he had left with his own troops at the gate. He became perplexed and distressed, but it came into his mind that as after the first attack the vanguard of Daryā Khān's army had fled and gone away towards Aḥmadābād, the news of his defeat might have been spread about in the city; and he should therefore betake himself there. Then with the five men who were with him he advanced to Aḥmadābād; and going to the royal palace made a proclamation of his victory. When the citizens saw 'Ālam Khān, as they had seen some of the fugitives belonging to (Daryā Khān's) vanguard a moment before, they became sure of Daryā Khān's defeat. They came in a large body; and waited on him. He gave an order, and in a moment the people plundered Daryā Khān's house and having strengthened the gates of the city, sent swift messengers to bring Sultān Maḥmūd. The messengers from Aḥmadābād came to Daryā Khān, who had after gaining the victory (over the troops that were opposed to him), halted in his camp; and informed him of what was happening at Aḥmadābād. He then advanced towards that city. As the families of the *amīrs* were in the city, which was in the possession of 'Ālam Khān, most of them separated from Daryā Khān before he arrived there. About this time Sultān Maḥmūd also arrived. Daryā Khān then fled towards Burhānpūr and matters turned <sup>2</sup> upside down. Daryā Khān did not find a resting place at Burhānpūr, and went to Shūr Khān Afghān, and <sup>3</sup> was received with favour by him. After the departure of Daryā Khān, 'Ālam Khān took up the post and the work of the *razārāt*. But he also, owing to his great pride, wanted

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has جماعه جماعه while the other has جماعه and the lith. ed. has جماعت Firishtah also has جماعت but I prefer جماعت جماعت.

<sup>2</sup> The words are قضیه منعکس شد. There are no similar words in Firishtah and the Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt. I think the meaning is, that Daryā Khān had defeated Mirūn Muḥarrak Shāhī, and the latter had to sue for peace. The tables were now turned, and Daryā Khān had to go and seek shelter in Burhānpūr.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah and the Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt also say so. The latter says he entered the service of Shūr Khān; but the Cambridge History of India, page 330, gives an account of some of his further adventures, and of an unsuccessful attempt made by him and 'Ālam Khān Lodi, who according to the Cambridge History of India had now joined him to place 'Alī-ud-dīn Fath Khān of the royal line of Sind on the throne of Gujarāt.

to be independent and overbearing like Daryā Khān in all respects. Sultān Maḥmūd got the *amīrs* to combine with him, and attempted to seize him. He received warning of this, and fled and went to Shēr Khān. After his mind had been set at rest by the termination of the dissensions of the rebel *amīrs*, Sultān Maḥmūd set himself to manage the government of the country, to increase the cultivation and to comfort the soldiers. Within a short time he restored the country to its original condition. He treated the nobles and other great men, and the gentry and pious men with kindness and favour. He carried on the government till the year 961 A.H. without any dissension and any enemy.

<sup>1</sup> But in the month of Rabi-ul-āwwal of that year, one of his servants who had the name of Burhān, and who showed himself to be a man of piety in the eyes of men, and devoted most of his time in prayer and worship, and always acted as the Sultān's *pēsh-namāz* or leader in the prayers, in a louting excursion murdered him. The particulars of this brief statement are these: on one occasion, the Sultān shut him up between walls on account of some fault committed by him in his service, and left an aperture for his breath to pass

---

<sup>1</sup> Before mentioning the assassination of Sultān Maḥmūd, Firishtah mentions the foundation of the new city of Maḥmūdābād, which, however, could not be completed by the Sultān, and also the erection of the fort of Sūrat under the supervision of Ghadāfar Āqā, his Turkī slave, who had the title of Khudāwand Khān. The Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt says that Humāyūn after his restoration wrote a letter to Sultān Maḥmūd, proposing an alliance, and suggesting that Sultān Maḥmūd should invade Mālwa, while he himself would advance against others, whom he, rather vaguely, describes as *مخالفان باعى* or rebellious enemies. Accordingly, Sultān Maḥmūd took a muster roll of his troops, and *چادر بر سر زدند*, which I suppose means, invaded Mandū (pp. 43, 44). The Mirāt-i-Sikandari has a long account of Sultān Maḥmūd's liking for low company, and of his conferring the title of Muḥāfiz Khān on Jarjī the pigeon fancier: and of this man's insolence towards the *amīrs*, and his getting a *farmān* from the Sultān for the execution of 'Alā-ud-dīn Lōdī and Shujā'at Khān. The *amīrs* then demanded that Jarjī should be made over to them. The Sultān refused to do so. The *amīrs* pretended to accept the Sultān's order, but prayed that he would allow them to make their obeisance to him. The Sultān held a *darbār*, and when Jarjī appeared there, he was murdered in open *darbār* in the Sultān's presence. The *amīrs* then made a plan for guarding the Sultān, and later of blinding him, and dividing the kingdom among themselves (Bayley, pp. 421-423).

through, but after a time released him. The wretched Burhān kept this old grudge concealed in his mind. He united with himself a number of hunters, whose occupation was to hunt tigers, and promised each one of them the rank of an *amīr*. One night when the Sultān had gone to sleep after coming back from hunting, he in concert with his nephew (sister's son) named Daulat, who was in close attendance on the Sultān, tied <sup>1</sup>the latter's hair firmly to the wood of his bedstead, and passed a sword across his throat. That victim (of their cruelty) had placed both his hands on the edge of the sword, so that his hands were also cut, and he was murdered. (Burhān then) kept the tiger hunters hidden in a corner, and sent men to summon the great *amīrs*. He also told the musicians that the Sultān had ordered that they should play on their instruments outside the house.

Half the night had passed when he secured the attendance of *Khudāwand Khān* and *Āṣaf Khān*, who were both the *vazīrs*; and took them to a private chamber, and had them murdered. In the same way he summoned twelve of the great *amīrs* and killed them all. Then his men went to summon *I'tmād Khān*. The latter said, "The Sultān cannot possibly have sent for me at such a time; I have only a little while ago come from attending on him"; and he delayed in coming. Burhān sent another man to summon him. His suspicion and alarm became greater, and he did not come. When *Afdal Khān*, who was one of the distinguished *amīrs* and with whom Burhān had ancient friendship came, Burhān took him to a private place, and told him, "The Sultān is displeased with *Khudāwand Khān* and *Āṣaf Khān*, and wants you to take their place, and he has sent this robe of the *vazārat* for you". *Afdal Khān* said, "Until I go to the Sultān's presence and see him, I shall not put on the robe". Burhān then took *Afdal Khān* to the place, where the martyr Sultān was lying, and said, "I have killed the Sultān and the *vazīrs* and all the nobles. I now make you my *vazīr*,

---

<sup>1</sup> The accounts of the murder as given in *Firishtah* and the *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* and the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* and the *Cambridge History of India* agree mainly with that in the text; but there are various differences in details. It was committed on the night of the 12th of *Rabī'ul-āwwal*, the anniversary of the birth of the Prophet Muḥammad. The murderer is called Burhān in all the histories, except the *Cambridge History of India*, where he is called *Burhān-ud-dīn* (p. 342).



## Couplets:

Three sovereigns died in the course of a year,  
 Through their justice, was *Hind* (India) the seat of peace.  
 One Maḥmūd Shāh, of Gujrāt Sultān,  
 Who like his grandeur, youthful was;  
 The other Islām Khān of Dehli Sultān,  
 Who in his reign, was a Lord of Conjunction great.  
 The third was Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri,  
 Who in the Deccan, held sovereign sway.  
 Of the date of the death of these sovereigns three  
 If they ask thee 't was "the death of monarchs great".

Sultān Maḥmūd was <sup>1</sup> a virtuous ruler, and possessed pleasant manners. He spent most of his time in the society of learned and pious men; and on great days, such as the day of the death of His Holiness the Prophet, may the blessings of God and His peace be on him! and on the dates of the deaths of his own ancestors, and on other auspicious days, he gave food to *faqīrs* and other deserving persons. He held the ewer and the basin in his own hand and washed the hands of the men. <sup>2</sup> And *sarīṣāf* and all pieces of cloth, which were intended for his own garments, were first made into <sup>3</sup> table-cloths for *darwīshes* and *faqīrs*, and afterwards fashioned into wearing apparel for him.

<sup>1</sup> The actual words are بادشاه نیک نهاد و پسندیده اطوار بود.

<sup>2</sup> The readings in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. are unintelligible at this place. The MSS. have و یارچهای سرمصاف و میریارچه. The lith. ed. has the same with the exception that instead of سرمصاف it has سرماف. The corresponding passage in Firishtah has و یارچهای سرمصاف که بجہت پوشش او مقرر بود. This makes sense. It means the *sarīṣāf* and other kinds of cloth, which were intended for garments for his own use, were first made into turbans and garments for the *darwīshes*, etc. Firishtah has been followed in the text-edition except that بود has been changed to بودی.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have دستار خان, but the other MS. has دستار خوان; but see the preceding note, from which it will appear that in the corresponding passage Firishtah has دستار و جامه.

At a distance of twelve *karōhs* from Aḥmadābād, he laid the foundation of the city, to which he gave the name of <sup>1</sup> Maḥmūdābād: and built an areaded *bāzār* from Aḥmadābād to that place. He also established a deer park on the bank of the stream called <sup>2</sup> Khari nadi, and built a wall of burnt bricks adorned with turrets for a distance of seven <sup>3</sup> *karōhs*. In this deer park he erected beautiful structures at different places; and various kinds of animals were allowed to roam about free in the park; and they increased and multiplied by breeding in it. As he was very fond of the society of women, he collected a large number of them in his harem. He always hunted and played *chaugān* in the deer park with them. The trees in it were wrapt in red and green velvet. There were many pleasant gardens in it and handsome women were engaged in attending to them.

Whenever any of the women in his harem became pregnant, he ordered that she should have a miscarriage; and did not allow any of them to have a male child. He had made Iʿtmād Kḥān the attendant of his harem, and had directed him to attend to the direction of the ladies. Iʿtmād Kḥān had by way of prudence and caution, destroyed his own virility by eating camphor. The writer of this book has on various occasions visited the deer park and the buildings in it.

As visits to the tomb (of holy men) by the women, and their gathering together on various <sup>4</sup> pretexts had become extremely common in Gujrat; and immorality and licentiousness had become, as it were, a matter of habit and custom, and there was (in the opinion of the people) no wickedness in such conduct, Sultān Maḥmūd forbade the going of women to these places, and their going and coming during days and nights to the houses of people. He also

<sup>1</sup> The town had been built by his ancestor Maḥmūd Bēgarha; and Sultān Maḥmūd III, took up his residence in it, and restored and enlarged it.

<sup>2</sup> M. Hidayat Ḥosain has کهار ندی in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have the words دغلی را between کروه and دیوار از خشت پخته.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. has بهانه instead of خانه.

gave money to <sup>1</sup> some, and sent them to procure women, and when they brought them before him, he ordered them to be punished: and in this way he <sup>2</sup> effectively stopped such arts.

### <sup>3</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN AHMAD.

When Sultān Mahmūd became a martyr and left no son behind him, Utmād Khān, in order to prevent the bursting out of the flames of disorder and disturbance, produced a <sup>4</sup> boy of tender years by the

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the lith ed. have "بعضی" but the other MS. has "مردم" which appears to me to be better, and has been adopted in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> The actual words are "دو درختی سدّی باب کورده بود", which translated literally, would be, had in the best way closed this door. The MSS. have "خونور", but the lith ed. has "خونور".

<sup>3</sup> This is the heading in the MS. The lith. ed. has "ذکر سلطنت احمد شاه".

<sup>4</sup> This is the account in the MSS. and in the lith ed. Firishlah, however, says that it was Razī-ul-mulk, who produced the youth, who was a descendant of Ahmad Shāh II. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* (Hayley, pp. 454, 455) says, that after the death of Sultān Mahmūd, the *amir* inquired of Utmād Khān, who was fully acquainted with the late Sultān's domestic affairs, whether the latter had left a son behind him. On his answering in the negative, they inquired whether any of his widows was expecting a child. This also he answered in the negative. They then inquired, whether there was any relative of the Sultān, who was fit to succeed to the throne. He said there was a youth of the name of Ahmad Khān who was living in Ahmadābād. Razī-ul-Mulk was accordingly sent in a cart with very fast horses. He found Ahmad Khān buying some grain at a shop near his house, and recognising him, brought him at once to Mahmūdābād. The account in the *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* (pp. 49, 50) agrees, except that it says that the nobles wanted to know from Utmād Khān if the late Sultān had even left a daughter behind, so that they might place her on the throne. Here again the answer was in the negative. Then it became necessary to enquire about distant relations: so Razī-ul-mulk, one of the descendants of Ahmad Shāh, the founder of Ahmadābād, who was five or six generations below him, and was a youth in his twelfth year, was brought forward.

It will be seen that there is considerable amount of divergence among the four historians, who were more or less contemporaneous with the events which they were describing. According to the author of the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, whose father Shaikh Mahmūd, commonly called Shaikh Mānjūh, was the manager of Saiyid Mubārak's affairs, the name of the youth, who was selected to be the Sultān, was Ahmad Khān, and Razī-ul-Mulk was the name of the man who was sent to bring him from Ahmadābād. Firishlah appears to agree, though

name Raḍi-ul-mulk, describing him as a descendant of Sultān Aḥmad, the founder of Aḥmadābād; and in concert with <sup>1</sup> Mirān Saiyid Mubārak Bukhārī, and the other *amīrs*, who had escaped with their lives from the sword of the ungrateful Burhān, placed him on the throne of empire, and gave him the title of Aḥmad Shāh. They comforted the *amīrs* by confirming their *jāgīrs*. I'tmād Khān kept the affairs of the kingdom in his own hand, and left the newly chosen Sultān nothing but the name; and having obtained the whole power, kept him (confined) in his house.

When five years had passed in this way, Sultān Aḥmad unable any longer to remain in this state got out of Aḥmadābād, and went to Maḥmūdābād to Saiyid Mubārak Bukhārī, who was one of the great *amīrs*. Mūsā Khān Fūlādī and Sūdāt Khān and 'Ālam Khān Lādī and other men collected round him. <sup>2</sup> Shaikh Yūsuf also went and joined him. The Sultān conferred on him the title of Ā'zam Humāyūn. I'tmād Khān, in concert with 'Imād-ul-mulk, father of Chengiz Khān, and Ungū Khān and Juhjār Khān Ḥabshī and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk and other *amīrs* of Gujrāt with a part of artillery attacked Saiyid Mubārak. The latter although he had a smaller army than I'tmād Khān arrayed his troops to meet him in battle. When the battle began, a <sup>3</sup> cannon ball struck Saiyid Mubārak, and he was slain; and Sultān Aḥmad was defeated. He wandered

he does not give the name of the youth who was raised to the throne; but the *Ṭabaqāt* and the *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* say that it was Raḍi-ul-mulk, who was placed on the throne.

The Cambridge History of India (p. 343) does not mention these differences, but in its own confident way, gives a narrative which differs in some particulars from all of them. It says that one Khalil Shāh was at first reported to be a son of the murdered Sultān, but on enquiry he could not be produced; and the writer surmises, that there was a conspiracy to foist a lad of unknown parentage on the throne, but the conspirators lost heart at the last moment. This Khalil Shāh is mentioned by none of the other historians. Then Razi-ul-Mulk who was the great-grand-son of Shakar Khān, a younger son of Ahmad I. was raised to the throne with the title of Ahmad Shāh II.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. omits the prefix Mirān.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah calls him Ā'zam Khān Mālvi.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah also says *مگلوله توپ*, but the Cambridge History of India, page 344, says that Saiyid Mubārak was killed by an arrow.



of that child. He received the title of Muẓaffar Shāh; and the *amīrs* offered congratulations and felicitations on his accession.

The duties of the *vazārat* continued to be entrusted to I'tmād Khān; and he received the title of *Masnād-i-'Ālī*. The great *amīrs* having acquired independence in their *jāgīrs* did not allow anyone to interfere with them. Among them the district of Pattan as far as the *pargana* of <sup>1</sup>Karī came into the possession of Mūsā Khān and Shēr Khān Fūlādī. In <sup>2</sup>Rādhanpūr and Tarwāra and Tahrād and Maujpūr, and some other *parganas*, Fath Khān Balūch was in possession. <sup>3</sup>The *parganas*, which were situated between the Sāhar-matī and the Mahindrī were in the possession of I'tmād Khān, who gave a portion of them to other Gujrātīs. The port of Sūrath and Nāgūt and Chūmpānūr were in the possession of Chengīz Khān son of 'Imād-ul-mulk Sultānī. Rustam Khān who was the husband of Chengīz Khān's sister held Bahrōj. Dūlqa and Dandūka were allotted to Saiyid Mirān son of Saiyid Mubārak Bukhārī. Amīn Khān Ghūrī seized the fort of Junāgarh, and Sūrath; and <sup>4</sup>kept himself aloof from the other *amīrs* of Gujrāt.

---

procured to swear to these facts and the evidence being considered sufficient, the boy was crowned. The version of the *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* has already been given. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, says that I'tmād Khān's history was totally false, but as an heir had to be found, the boy he produced was accepted.

<sup>1</sup> The name is مُرِّي in one MS. and in the lith. ed. It is omitted in the other. Firishtah lith. ed. has کدلی, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 156) has Kurry. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, has Kādī.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah agrees as to the first two names. He does not mention the third, and calls the fourth مُورچپور Mūrchpūr. Col. Briggs calls them Radumpoor, Neriad, Tehrawara and Moonjpoor. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, does not give the names, but says the whole of the north of Gujarāt as far south as Kādī was in the possession of Mūsā Khān and Shēr Khān and Fath Khān. The *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* does not specify the *jāgīrs* of the different *amīrs*, but says they were all trying to extend their respective *jāgīrs*, and encroaching on that of I'tmād Khān; and the latter sent petitions to Akbar to invade Gujarāt.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India, page 345, agree generally; but Firishtah and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 156) call Roostoom Khān the nephew (خواهر زاد) of Chungiz Khan. The Cambridge History of India agrees with the *Tabaqāt* in calling him his brother-in-law.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. has نفاق instead of اتفاق.

I'tmād Khān kept Sultān Muẓaffar Nanū, <sup>1</sup> more or less in a state of imprisonment, in the palace of the Sultān. On the days of audience a *masnad* used to be spread for him, and having seated him on it, I'tmād Khān himself <sup>2</sup> sat behind him. The *amīrs* attended to salute the Sultān. When some days had passed in this way, Chengīz Khān and <sup>3</sup> Shēr Khān Fūlādī arrived at Almadābād to offer their condolences and congratulations to the Sultān. <sup>4</sup> When a year had passed in this way the Fūlādīs having found an opportunity, attacked Faṭḥ Khān Balūch, who had *parganas* Tahrād and Tarwāra and Rādhanpūr and <sup>5</sup> Mūrwāra and Kākraj as his *jāgīr*, and who on account of his proximity had hostility with them. He fought with them, was defeated, and went to I'tmād Khān and complained to him. I'tmād Khān was enraged at this and having collected troops attacked the Fūlādīs with a large and powerful force. The latter shut themselves up in the fort of Pattan, and commenced to show their weakness and repentance. I'tmād Khān did not accept their excuses; and went on vigorously with the siege. When the Fūlādī Afghāns were reduced to great straits, the young warriors among <sup>6</sup> them collected together, and going to Mūsā Khān and Shēr Khān, said that as (I'tmād Khān) does not accept our humility, there is no other alternative but that we should fight with him, and if necessary surrender our lives. Five hundred of them then sallied out of the fort; and Mūsā Khān and Shēr Khān with the men that they had—whose numbers did not amount to three thousand—also came out. I'tmād Khān arrayed the Gujrātī army, which exceeded thirty thousand horsemen. The Fūlādīs

<sup>1</sup> The words are محبوس گویا.

<sup>2</sup> در پی سر او, *lit.*, behind his head.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. omits the name of Shēr Khān Fūlādī, apparently by mistake, for the suffix Fūlādī, which belongs to Shēr Khān is appended to the name of Chengīz Khān. Firishtah has both names.

<sup>4</sup> It is possible that something has been omitted here, for it was hardly necessary to mention the arrival of Chengīz Khān and Shēr Khān, unless it was meant to lead to something.

<sup>5</sup> This may be the same as Maujpūr already mentioned. In the text-edition گاکریج has been adopted in place of کاکریج.

<sup>6</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have این جماعه but the other MS. has این طایفه.

hurled themselves on I'tmād Khān's special troops and drove them away. Hājī Khān, a slave of Salīm Khān the son of Shēr Khān, who was one of the leaders of I'tmād Khān's army stood aside without joining in the battle. I'tmād Khān was defeated and went back to Aḥmadābād. He endeavoured to seize Hājī Khān. The latter, becoming aware of it, fled and joined the Fūlādīs. They then sent a message to I'tmād Khān to the following effect: "As a half of *pargana* Karī was the *jāgīr* of Hājī Khān, and he has come and joined us, you should relinquish possession of it". I'tmād Khān did not agree to this, and replied, "He was my servant. Although he has fled and gone away, why should I give up his *jāgīr*?" Mūsū Khān and Shēr Khān then collected a force and came to the *jāgīr* of Hājī Khān; and posted themselves in the town of <sup>1</sup>Jūthānah. I'tmād Khān again collected a force and came and met them. They stood opposing one another for a period of four months; and at last engaged in battle. I'tmād Khān was defeated; and went to Chengīz Khān at Bahrōj; and brought him to help and reinforce himself. The parties again met in the neighbourhood of Jūthānah. After a great deal of talk, there was an amicable settlement. I'tmād Khān gave up possession of Hājī Khān's *jāgīr*; and went back and took up his quarters at Aḥmadābād.

Chengīz Khān went back to his own country; and began to aspire to independence. It became bruited about among men, that he had no wish to continue to be in allegiance, and no intention to act as a subject. He sent a message to I'tmād Khān to the following effect: "I am a *khānazād* or slave of this threshold (i.e., of the Sultāns of Gujrāt); and have knowledge of every incident that takes place in the harem. It was known as a matter of certainty till today, that the martyred Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh had no son; and in spite of that you have produced a boy before the people, describing him as the son of Sultān Maḥmūd. And what is the meaning of this that he himself sits in the *majlis*, and his men guard that boy? And as long as he does not come no one can go to offer homage. If in fact the boy

---

<sup>1</sup> The name is written as چوتنه in the MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. It is جهونان in the lith. ed. of the Ṭabaqāt. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, has Jotāna.

is the son of Sultān Maḥmūd, then he (I'tmād Khān) should like all the other *amīrs* and the special tribesmen render homage; and when the other *amīrs* sit down in the *majlis* he should also sit down after obtaining permission". I'tmād Khān wrote in reply: "I solemnly swore on the day of the accession in the presence of the great men of the city and the *amīrs*, that this boy was the son of Sultān Maḥmūd; and they relying on my words placed the imperial crown on his head, and rendered homage to him. And as to what you have said about my sitting in the *majlis*, it is known to everyone, <sup>1</sup> what my rank and condition in the service of Sultān Maḥmūd was. You were only a boy at that time. If your father 'Imūl-ul-mulk Sultānī had been alive, he would have testified to the truth of what I am saying. This lord and master of ours, the son of our martyr lord and master, by whose accession the imperial throne has now acquired a new beauty and glory, is your sovereign and the son of your sovereign. Your well being consists in this that you do not turn your head from service and allegiance to serve him, so that you may gather the fruit of your desire from the tree of hope".

And Shēr Khān Fīlādī having become aware of this correspondence wrote a letter to Chengiz Khān to the following effect: "You should for a few days draw your feet beneath the skirt of patience, and should not abandon the path of gentleness, and should not unnecessarily begin a show of hostility towards *Masnad-i-'Ālī* (I'tmād Khān)". <sup>2</sup> After some days Chengiz Khān, having struck the teeth of greed into the town of Barōla, sent the following message: "Many men have collected round me and this contemptible country, which is in my possession, is not sufficient for them. As the reins of all affairs and the loosening and tying of all matters are entrusted to the wisdom and insight of *Masnad-i-'Ālī*, he should think about it". I'tmād Khān wanted to entangle him in a dispute with the rulers of Burhūnpūr, so that being engaged with them, he might not make any attempt

---

<sup>1</sup> The MSS. and the lith. ed. have در چه مرتبه. I think the correct reading should be مرتبه چه در, and I have adopted it.

<sup>2</sup> Firishlah copies the *Tabaqāt* almost word for word, but with reference to Chengiz Khān's demand for additional territory, he says in so many words, what indeed is implied in the *Tabaqāt*, that he did not agree to Shēr Khān's suggestion.

against these parts. He accordingly sent the following reply, "The town of Nadarbār was always in the possession of the *amīrs* of Gujrāt. At the time when the martyr Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh was in the fort of Sāwal, in the company of Mirān Mubārak Shāh, he made a promise to the latter that if the great and holy God should ever place the reins of the government of the country of Gujrāt in his grasp of power, he would make Nadarbār over to him as a reward. After that the martyr Sultān sat on the throne of the empire; and in order to fulfil his promise, which is the absolute duty of and is entirely incumbent on all great men, he gave the town of Nadarbār to Mirān Mubārak Shāh. Now that the Sultān has attained the rank of a martyr and Mirān Mubārak Shāh has also departed (from the world), it is advisable that you should march with your troops to the town of Nadarbār, and should with great quickness, in order to increase your revenue take possession of it, till in the course of time some better plan can be devised".

Chengiz Khān was duped, and commenced to collect troops. After a few days, he advanced to Bahrōj with a well-equipped army ready for action; and marching by successive stages, took possession of Nadarbār. Owing to his vanity, conceit and pride he advanced still further, till he reached the neighbourhood of the fort of <sup>1</sup> Tālnūr. It so happened that at this time news came that <sup>2</sup> Mirān Muḥammad Shāh son of Mirān Mubārak Shāh was coming to give him battle, in concert with Tufāl Khān and the Rāja of Māhūr. Chengiz Khān posted his army in a place which was broken and cut up by ravines; and on the side on which the ground was even, he strengthened his position by a line of carts fastened by chains. Muḥammad Shāh and Tufāl Khān arrayed their troops in a line in front of Chengiz Khān's army and waited till sunset. As Chengiz Khān did not come

<sup>1</sup> The lith. ed. of *Firishtah* has by mistake Thānūsar; but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 159) has Talnere, and the *Cambridge History of India*, page 346, has Thālner.

<sup>2</sup> *Firishtah* and the *Cambridge History of India* agree, but the former calls Mirān Muḥammad Shāh Muḥammad Mirān Shāh; and the latter rather inadequately describes him as Muḥammad II. Tufāl Khān is called ruler of Berār by *Firishtah*; and is described as of Berar in the *Cambridge History of India* (p. 346). The Rāja of Māhūr is not mentioned by either.

out, they encamped where they were. Chengīz Khān <sup>1</sup> owing to the bad luck due to his pride and malice, was so overwhelmed with fear and alarm that leaving all his troops and followers behind, he fled to Bahrōj. Muḥammad Shāh seized much booty and pursued Chengīz Khān as far as Nadarbār, and again took possession of that *pargana*.

When Chengīz Khān arrived in the fort of Bahrōj after his defeat, he began to repair the damage which his army had sustained; and having acquired new strength and vigour, from <sup>2</sup> the coming of Ibrāhīm Ḥunsain Mirzā and Shāh Mirzā, descendants of Muḥammad Sultān Mirzā, his own determination to punish I'tmād Khān was revived <sup>3</sup> in his mind. In order to carry out this design, he collected troops, and advanced towards Aḥmadābād. He occupied the town of Barōda without any fighting. When he arrived at Maḥmūdābād he sent the following message to I'tmād Khān, namely that "It is patent and evident to the world and to all its inhabitants that my defeat at Tālnir was really due to your malice; for if <sup>4</sup> you had either come yourself to reinforce me or had sent a body of troops, the dust of flight would not at all have settled on the skirts of my honour. Now I am coming to Aḥmadābād in order to offer my congratulations and felicitations to the Sultān in person; and I know that if you are present in the city, some dispute or hostility is sure to occur. It is, therefore, desirable that you should go out of the city, and like all the other *amirs*, take up your abode in your *jāgīr*, and make the arms of the Sultān strong in the government, so that he may exercise every act of dominion in his ancestral territory in any way that he may like".

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah copies this almost literally, except that he says that Chengīz Khān fled *خود حشم* *با تباہی*. The Cambridge History of India (p. 346) says that he was attacked, defeated and fled, instead of fleeing ignominiously without being attacked at all.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah explains that the Mirzās fled from Sambal, and came to Mālwa, and when Akbar's army advanced against them in 975 A.H., they having no other alternative came and joined Chengīz Khān.

<sup>3</sup> Both MSS. have *در خاطرش*; but the lith. ed. has *از خاطرش*.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. inserts *و* between *اگر* and *بکرمک*; but the other MS. and the lith. ed. do not.

I'tmād Khān had commenced to equip his army even before the arrival of this message; and when it came, he knew what Chengiz Khān's real object was. He raised the royal umbrella over the head of Muẓaffar, and in concert with the Saiyids of Bukhāra and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk and Malik Sharq and Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān and Saif-ul-mulk left the city, and encamped in the neighbourhood of the town of Batūh. The next day they marched from there and halted at *mauḍa'* <sup>1</sup> Kāvri, which is situated on the bank of the Khūri nadi, and is six *kārōhs* from Aḥmadābād. On the morning of the next day Chengiz Khān arrayed his troops, and came out of Maḥmūdābād, and advanced towards the battlefield. When he arrived at *mauḍa'* Kāvri, at the time of the morning meal, I'tmād Khān placed Sultān Muẓaffar on a horse, and placing the royal umbrella over his head, advanced towards the battlefield, and the Saiyids and the Gujrati *amīrs* and the *Habshī* group took up their positions. When the two armies faced each other, and the frightened eyes of I'tmād Khān fell on Chengiz Khān's army, as he had <sup>2</sup> formerly repeatedly heard of the courage and prowess of the Mirzās, he imagined each one of those <sup>3</sup> brave men and bold warriors to be the captor of his sword, and took the way of flight before even a sword was drawn out of its scabbard, and fled towards Dūngarpūr without even going to Aḥmadābād. The other *amīrs* also fled, after heaping a hundred <sup>4</sup> plaudits on I'tmād Khān. The Saiyids went to Dūlqa, and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk to Maḥmūdābād. Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān and the others went towards Aḥmadābād, taking Muẓaffar with them.

Chengiz Khān was pleased and delighted at gaining this victory, which was one of the favours of God; and halted at Batūh. Early on the following morning, Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān and the other *Habshīs* left Aḥmadābād by the Kūlpūr gate, taking Sultān Muẓaffar with them; and went towards Bīrpūr and Ma'mūrābād. When

<sup>1</sup> M. Hidayat Ḥosain also has *کوری* as the name of the *mauḍa'* in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has *سابق* while the other and the lith. ed. have *سابقاً*.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has *دلواران* instead of *دلیران*.

<sup>4</sup> The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* have *آفرین*. One would have thought that *نفرین* would be the right word.

Muzaffar was leaving Aḥmadābād, Chengīz Khān entered the place, and took up his abode at the mansion of I'tmād Khān. Shēr Khān Fūlādī on hearing this news in the neighbourhood in the town of Karī sent a message to Chengīz Khān to the effect that all this country had been in the possession of I'tmād Khān to defray the expense of the Sultān; and now that he alone had come to be in possession of it, it <sup>1</sup> was contrary to the custom of generosity and the rules of kindness; and he advanced with a large army towards Aḥmadābād. Chengīz Khān saw that it was not expedient, that he should at such a time be engaged in a dispute with Shēr Khān. He, therefore, settled with the latter that whatever should be situated on the other side of the river Sābarmatī should belong to him. Owing to this some portions of Aḥmadābād, such as <sup>2</sup> 'Usmānpūr, Khānpūr and Kālūpūr fell into Shēr Khān's share. Chengīz Khān held the Mīrzās in great honour and regard owing to the excellent services, which they have rendered him.

As Mīrān Muḥammad Shāh, son of Mīrān Mubārak Shāh had been emboldened by his first victory, and found the kingdom of Gujrāt without a head, he considering the disputes and hostility among the *amīrs* to be a very great mercy, advanced with the object of conquering the country, and did not draw his reins till he came opposite to Aḥmadābād. Chengīz Khān in concert with the Mīrzās, came out of the city with the object of giving battle. The Mīrān was defeated in the battle which took place and fled and went back to Asīr in great confusion, losing everything that he had with him.

As this victory was gained by the great exertions of the Mīrzās, Chengīz Khān in order to please them, allotted some fertile and well

---

<sup>1</sup> The sentence is rather clumsily worded, although its purport is clear enough. Shēr Khān did not think it right that Chengīz Khān should get hold of the whole of the territory, and he should have no part of it, but it is not quite clear what was remote from *أُذُن مَرُوت و رِسم قُوت*. Probably he wanted to appeal to Chengīz Khān's better nature; but in that case one would expect that he would wait for the result of that appeal, instead of marching at once at the head of a large army.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has I'tmūdpūr, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have 'Usmānpūr. The first MS. and the lith. ed. have Kālūpūr after Khānpūr, but the other MS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah omit Khānpūr.



populated *parganas* in *sarkār* Bahrōj as their *jāgīrs*; and gave them permission to go there; so that they might entertain retainers and equip them. When they arrived in the estates appertaining to their *jāgīrs*, and low class people, and the people who were always in search of adventure collected round them, and as the revenues of their *jāgīrs* did not suffice for their entertainment, they found it necessary to occupy other estates without the permission of Chengiz Khān. <sup>1</sup> When this news reached the latter, he sent an army to attack them. They defeated that army and slew a number of the men; and advanced towards the territory of Barhānpūr, and after interfering in the affairs of that country they went to Mālwa. The details of the affairs of the Mirzās have already been narrated in the history of His Majesty the Khālifa-i-Īlāhī.

In short, when Uluḡ Khān and Juhjūr Khān went to the country of <sup>2</sup> Kānthū, which is the name given to the broken country along the bank of the river Mahindri, taking Muẓaffar with them, and waited for a long time in the expectation, that perhaps Iṭmūd Khān would come himself, or send his son Shēr Khān to take Muẓaffar away; but as there was no hint of any kind from him, they themselves took Sultān Muẓaffar to Dūngarpūr, and made him over to Iṭmūd Khān. After some days they asked for some money from him to defray the expenses of their soldiers. Iṭmūd Khān told them in reply that the yield or revenue of his *jāgīr*, such as it was, known to all; and also the amount of his expenditure; and besides the place where they were was not

---

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah goes into greater detail about the force sent by Chengiz Khān against the Mirzās, and about the proceeding of the latter, after their victory, and also gives a reason for their retiring to Barhānpūr. According to him Chengiz Khān's army consisted of three or four thousand Habshis, and five or six thousand Gujrātis. The Mirzās after defeating the army put a number of them to death, and pursuing the others captured a number of men, both Habshis and Gujrātis. The young and beardless among them they kept as personal attendants, and released the others who had beards, after treating them with great barbarity, putting arrows through their noses, and binding their arms behind them, and placing circular pieces of wood round their necks. As they did all this, and knew that Chengiz Khān would come in person to attack them, they went away towards Barhānpūr.

<sup>2</sup> The name is Kānthū in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and Kānhū in the other MS. It is Kānth in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

a city, that he should be able to pay them after taking a loan from someone. Owing to this, <sup>1</sup> Ulugh Khān and the other *amīrs* were annoyed with I'tmād Khān.

Chengīz Khān <sup>2</sup> becoming aware of this, sent conciliatory letters to each one of them, and asked them to come to him. Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān and Saif-ul-mulk and other *Habshīs* advanced towards Ma'mūrābād without obtaining leave from I'tmād Khān; and having met Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk Gujrātī there, they all went forward towards Aḥmadābād. When they arrived at the Kākriā tank or reservoir, which is close to the city, they halted at the garden of Sultān Maḥmūd to change their dresses. At that time Chengīz Khān came there in haste to welcome them; and met Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk, Ulugh Khān, Jhuhjār Khān and other *Habshīs* there. After they had finished making courteous enquiries about one another, Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān said, "It is clear to the world and to all men that we are all slaves born and bred in the house of Sultān Maḥmūd. If one of us has been favoured by fortune more than the other, yet as regards that primary fact there is no difference amongst us; and it is right that it should be borne in mind and observed in all our interviews. The reason for this remark is that among the Sultān's slaves, some have been distinguished by advancement in the service, and they are now present in this assembly. Hereafter whenever any of us has to salute or see any other, it is to be hoped that he will not be prevented by chamberlains and ushers". Chengīz Khān with great show of politeness, accepted this statement; and taking the other *amīrs* with him went to the city; and having caused some houses to be vacated, placed them at their disposal.

After some time, one day, a spy came to Ulugh Khān, and informed him that Chengīz Khān wanted to put him and Jhuhjār Khān to death;

<sup>1</sup> Firishtah agrees, but the Cambridge History of India, page 346, says that Ulugh Khān, whom it calls (Muhammad) Ulugh Khān and (Marjān) Jhūjhār Khān, awaited help from I'timād Khan or from Sher Khān Fūlādī, but being disappointed joined Ikhtiyār-ul-Mulk and marched with him to Aḥmadābād, thus omitting all mention of their visit to Dūngarpūr, and their making over of the Sultān to I'tmād Khān there.

<sup>2</sup> Both MSS. have وقوف حامل كرده but the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have وقوف يافته.

and he has settled, that on the following morning when you are careless, he will have you assassinated in the *chaugān* field. The test of the truth of this information is this, that if he goes tomorrow to the *chaugān* field near the Kākriā tank <sup>1</sup> there will be no danger, for it is an extensive plain; and one can escape from it in all directions. But if they go to the field of Bahdar, which is inside the citadel, you may note with certainty that he will effect his purpose there. The spy had not yet finished speaking, when a messenger came from Chengīz Khān; <sup>2</sup> and after prayers (for the interlocutor's well-being) said, "We (speaking apparently for his master) will go to the *chaugān* ground; will you also come early?" Ulugh Khān hearing this became anxious, and mounting his horse, went to the house of Saif-ul-mulk *Ḥabshī* Sultānī (i.e., Saif-ul-mulk the Abyssinian slave of the Sultān). There <sup>3</sup> Jhuhjār Khān and Saiyidi Badr Sultānī and Maḥaldūr Khān and Khurshīd Khān were sent for; and the matter was brought up for discussion. After much interchange of words, they all agreed, that they should forestall and kill Chengīz Khān.

Early the next morning, Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān mounted with their companions, and went to the *darbūr* (palace) of Chengīz Khān. The <sup>4</sup> latter came out mounted; and they all turned towards

<sup>1</sup> The readings in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. differ slightly, and they are all difficult to understand. One MS. has قصه اینست the other has قصه نیست while the lith. ed. has قصه است. The corresponding passage in *Firishtah* is خطری نیست. This is good sense and I have adopted it. But M. Hidnyat Hosain has retained قصه نیست in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> There is difference in the readings here also. The MSS. have آمد و بعد آمد دعا گفت, while the lith. ed. has آمده دعا رسانید که. This latter reading is manifestly incorrect as the word که should be changed to و; but otherwise it is somewhat better than the reading in the MSS.; but I have adopted the former, as it is found in both the MSS., and also in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*.

<sup>3</sup> These names are correctly given in the MSS., and in the lith. ed.; but *Firishtah* lith. ed. has جہاز خان, Jahūz Khān which is clearly a misprint for Jauhjār Khān and سیدی بدر شامی instead of Saiyid Badar Sultānī. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 102) has further changed Jahūz Khān to Hijaz Khan, but he does not mention the other man.

<sup>4</sup> *Firishtah* gives some more details, from which it appears, that when Ulugh Khān and Jahāz Khān arrived Chengīz Khān's soldiers and followers had not yet come, so a man had to be sent to him with their prayers and with the

the Bahdar *chaugān* field. After they had gone a part of the way, Ulugh Khān who was to the right of Chengīz Khān, made a sign to Jhuhjār Khān who was on his left side, that it was an opportunity that should not be lost. Jhuhjār Khān immediately struck Chengīz Khān with his sword in such a way <sup>1</sup> that it appeared as if his head had not at all been accompanying him. They then all galloped back to their houses and prepared to fight. Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk also joined with them and made ready. <sup>2</sup> Rustam Khān threw the body of Chengīz Khān on the back of an elephant and started towards Bahrōj, instead of taking it to his house in the city. The mob of the city then stretched their hands to plunder Chengīz Khān's followers.

When it was known for certain that Rustam Khān had gone away towards Bahrōj, Ulugh Khān and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk and Jhuhjār Khān and the other leaders went to the citadel which was known by the name Bahdar. They wrote a letter to I'tmād Khān, and informed him of what had happened and invited him to Aḥmadābād. On the same day Badr Khān and Muḥammad Khān, sons of Shēr Khān Fūlādī, came into the city in order to offer their congratulations; and brought presents of horses for every one (of the *amīrs*). They (?) confirmed anew the distribution of the *jagīrs* among the *amīrs*, as Chengīz Khān had settled it.

The next day Shēr Khān Fūlādī sent his spies, and ascertained, <sup>3</sup> that none of the retainers of the *amīrs* remained in the fort in Bahdar

request that it would be better if he came quickly. Chengīz Khān had apparently been drinking, but he came out mounted, after putting on some light clothing.

<sup>1</sup> The words گویا باد همراه نبود are somewhat fanciful and difficult to understand. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has introduced باو between گویا and همراه. Firishtah's language که سرش بیکدست از تن جدا شد is clear. As regards the complaint of Chengīz Khān's mother to Akbar about Jhuhjār Khān having killed her son, and Akbar's punishment of Jhuhjār Khān by ordering him to be trampled under the feet of an elephant, see page 389 of vol. II of the translation. Jhuhjār Khān apparently did not plead right of self-defence, as he might well have done.

<sup>2</sup> According to Firishtah, he was a nephew, sister's son of Chengīz Khān, who was following the latter with his troops. The Cambridge History of India, page 347, calls him Chengīz Khān's brother-in-law.

<sup>3</sup> Somewhat contrary to this, the Cambridge History of India, page 347, says that Ulugh Khān and his partisans took possession of the citadel.



I'tmūd Khān sent a messenger to Shēr Khān; and asked his opinion. Shēr Khān also agreed to undertake the expedition. It was then agreed, that the entire army should be divided into three detachments. The first detachment headed by Ulugh Khān and the other *Habshīs* should go one stage in advance. When they would advance beyond their first station, I'tmūd Khān and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk and the other *amīrs*, who would command the second detachment, should encamp there. When the second detachment should advance from that station, the third detachment, which would be commanded by Shēr Khān Fīlādī and other *amīrs*, should take up its position there. Sādāt Bukhārī should remain in the position where he was. When, according to this agreement, Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān and Saif-ul-mulk and the other *Habshīs* arrived at Maḥmūdābād, I'tmūd Khān<sup>1</sup> did not go out of the city, and cancelled the previous agreement.

Ulugh Khān and his friends suspecting treachery on his part, from this conduct, said to each other, "We slew a (powerful) enemy of his, like Chengīz Khān, and he is now acting traitorously towards us. It is advisable that we should take possession of this territory (fief), and divide it among ourselves". They confirmed this determination, and took possession of *pargana* Kaubāyet and Pātīlād and some other *parganas*. Men who had no *jāgīrs* came from the city, and joined the service of Ulugh Khān. The latter said to Jhuhjār Khān, "Soldiers

<sup>1</sup> There are variations in the readings, and they are all more or less incorrect. One MS. has اعتماد خان بیرون نرفت و فتح آن عزیمت نمود; the other has اعتماد خان از شهر بیرون نرفت و فتح آن عزیمت نمود; the lith. ed. agrees with the latter reading but substitutes مبع for فتح. It is needless to say that both مبع and فتح are utterly incorrect, and the correct word is فسخ. Firishatāh lith. ed. has it. His version is different, and I am quoting it, as it gives some reason for I'tmūd Khān's conduct. He says: - اعتماد خان متوهم شد و از شهر بیرون رفته فسخ آن عزیمت نمود, which means I'tmūd Khān became suspicious, and going out of the city cancelled the previous agreement. Col. Briggs's (vol. IV, p. 164) version is that "Etimad Khan, with his accustomed cowardice, threw obstacles in the progress of the second corps, which he commanded, and refused to move". The Cambridge History of India, page 347, also says: "I'timud Khan refused to leave the capital".



this letter, Shēr Khān went to the house of Saiyid Hāmid <sup>1</sup> Bukhārī, and enquired of him, as to what had been ascertained at the time of the accession. Saiyid Hāmid and the other Saiyids said, "I'tmād Khān swore on the *Qurān*, that the boy was a son of Sultān Maḥmūd; and he has now written these words on account of his enmity". Shēr Khān rode back from the house of Saiyid Hāmid, to that of Ulugh Khān; and with his bow in his hands rendered homage to Sultān Muẓaffar, in the way in which a servant does homage to his master; and mounting him on a horse, brought him to his own house, in order to render homage to him there.

I'tmād Khān summoned the Mirzās from the country of Bahrōj. He sent detachments from their followers, and those of Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk every day <sup>2</sup> to fight. Gradually the contention and hostility was much prolonged; and as I'tmād Khān saw that nothing was effected, he sent a petition to His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī; and begged him to come and conquer the country of Gujrāt. As it happened, at that time which was the year 988 (1572 A.D.), His Majesty had come to Nāgōr; and had sent Mir Muḥammad Ātka, who was celebrated as Khān Kalān, with a large army of renowned *amīrs* to conquer Sirōhī. As <sup>3</sup> the Khān Kalān was wounded by the ambassador of the Raja of Sirōhī, the emperor himself, with good fortune and prosperity, advanced towards the Khān Kalān's army; and (from there) without any delay marched towards Gujrāt. The particulars of this brief statement have been narrated in the history of the events of the reign of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī.

In short, when the world-conquering standards arrived at Pattan Gujrāt, Shēr Khān, who was at this time besieging Aḥmadābād, lost the use of his hands and feet (i.e., became utterly bewildered), and fled; and Ibrāhīm Husain Mirzā and his brothers went towards Barōda and Bahrōj. I'tmād Khān and <sup>4</sup> Mir Abū Turāb and Ulugh Khān

<sup>1</sup> M. Hidayat Husain has *سید حامد* in the text-edition instead of Saiyid Hāmid Būkhārī as in the translation above.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah adds: and the *Hushis*.

<sup>3</sup> He was actually wounded by one of the followers of the mission. See page 371 of vol. II of the translation.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah lith. ed. calls him Mirzā Abū Turāb Shīrāzī. He is the author of the *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt*, which has been edited by Sir Denison Ross. His full



*Ḥabshī* and Jhuhjār *Khān* and *Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk*, having determined on serving at the threshold, which was the abode of the angels, became enlisted in the band of the loyal servants. The kingdom of Gujrāt <sup>1</sup> ended here, and became a part of the imperial dominions of His Majesty the *Khalīfa-i-Īlāhī*. Other incidents connected with Sultān Muẓaffar *Khān* and the Gujrātīs have been narrated in the auspicious history of His Majesty the *Khalīfa-i-Īlāhī*.

The period of the rule of Sultān Muẓaffar extended to thirteen years and some months.

## SECTION VI. <sup>2</sup> THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF BANGĀLA.

It will not remain concealed from the minds of men of understanding, that the beginning of the appearance of Islām in the country of Bangāla was from (the time of) <sup>3</sup> Muḥammad Bakhtiyār who had been one of the great *amīrs* of <sup>4</sup> Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn Aibak. After him the *amīrs* of the Sultāns of Dehlī ruled one after another. Their histories have been narrated in the course of the history of the <sup>5</sup> Sultāns of Dehlī. When Malik Fakhr-ud-dīn who was the *silāhdār*, trooper or armour-bearer, of Qadr *Khān*, the ruler of Bangāla as Viceroy of

name appears to be Mir Abu Tīrūb Wālī who belonged to the Salāmī Saiyids of Shirūz.

<sup>1</sup> The correct date is given as the 14th Rajab, 980 A.H., in the lith. ed. of *Firishṭah*. The corresponding date according to Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 165) is November 20th, 1572. The same date is also given in the Cambridge History of India, page 348.

<sup>2</sup> This section which follows that about Mūlwa in the MSS. is printed between those about Gujrāt and Sharqīn in the lith. ed. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has followed the sequence in the lith. ed. for the text, and the same has been adopted for the translation.

The heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text. In the lith. ed. it is طبقة از حکومت سلاطین بنگاله .

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has Maḥmūd instead of Muḥammad.

<sup>4</sup> The same MS. has by mistake قطب بیگ سلطان Sultān Quṭb Bēg.

<sup>5</sup> Both MSS. have سلاطین طبقة دهلي . This is incorrect. If the word طبقة is at all inserted, it should be before سلاطین .

<sup>1</sup> Muḥammad Tughluq Shāh, slew him, he gave himself <sup>2</sup> the name of Sultān. After him the kingdom of Bangāla became separated from the empire of Dehlī, and the hand of the dominion of the Sultāns of Dehlī did not reach the kings (of Bangāla); and they appropriated <sup>3</sup> the name of Sultān for themselves.

The beginning of the section about Bangāla has been made from Malik Fakhr-ud-dīn. <sup>4</sup> (The names of the various Sultāns are):—

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has محمود, Maḥmūd.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has by mistake امرسر; but the other and the lith. ed. have اسم.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has اسم the other has مراسم; while the lith. ed. has مراسم اسم.

<sup>4</sup> For the list of the kings of Bengal as given in the Cambridge History of India, see vol. III, page 695. According to it there were two kings in east Bengal with their capital at Sōnārgāon in the Meghnā in the present district of Dacca; namely, Fakhr-ud-dīn Mubārak Shāh, 739 A.H., 1338 A.D. to 750 A.H., 1349 A.D.; and Ikhtiyār-ud-dīn Ghāzī Shāh, 750 A.H., 1349 A.D. to 753 A.H., 1352 A.D.; after which this kingdom was conquered by Hāji Shams-ud-dīn Iliyās Bhangara, and incorporated with western Bengal. The kings of western Bengal begin with No. 2 of the lists given in the Ṭabaqāt. As regards the names and period Firishtah agrees about No. 1; but about No. 2 he has one year and five months. As regards No. 5 there is great divergence. One MS. and the lith. ed. have ten years, the other MS. has two years. Firishtah has nine years and some months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 335) has ten years; and the Cambridge History of India, page 266, also gives him ten years from 1396 A.H., when he is said to have peaceably succeeded his father to 1406 A.H., when he died. In the list of the kings of Bengal, on page 695, however, he is only given two years from 1410 to 1412 A.H. No. 7 is said to have reigned for three years according to a MS. and the lith. ed. and Firishtah and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 336). The Cambridge History of India, page 266, says he was allowed to ascend the throne, but was a mere puppet and exercised no power; he died after a reign of little more than three years. His name is not, however, given in the lists on page 695, though another puppet, Shihāb-ud-dīn Bāyazīd, who succeeded him, has his name in that list. No. 8 is called Rāja Kāns in one MS., and Rāja Kānsī in the other. The lith. eds. both of the Ṭabaqāt and of Firishtah have Rāja Kāns. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 336) has Raja Kans Poorby. The Cambridge History of India, page 266, calls him Raja Ganēsh of Dinājpur, but says that he is called Raja Kāns by most Muslim historians; in the list on page 695 he is called Ganesh of Bhaduriā (Kāns Narāyan). About No. 9 there is no difference in the MSS. and in the lith. ed., except that one MS. calls the father Kānsī and not Kāns. Firishtah lith. ed. calls him Jīvmal the son of Kāns, who had the title of Sultān Jalāl-ud-dīn, and says that he ruled for seventeen years and some

months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 337) calls him Jeetmul entitled Jalal-ood-deen and says he reigned for seventeen years. The Cambridge History of India, page 266, calls him Jatinall, who was raised to the throne under the title of Jalāl-ud-dīn Muhammad and says he ruled for seventeen years. In the list on page 695, he is, however, called Jadu *alias* Jalāl-ud-dīn Muhammad Shāh. About No. 10 there is no difference in the MS. and the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah the word Sultān is prefixed to the name of the father and the period of his reign is said to have been sixteen years. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 338) calls him Ahmad Poorby and says he reigned for eighteen years. The Cambridge History of India, page 267 and also page 695, calls him Shams-ud-dīn Ahmad Shāh, and says he reigned for eleven years only from 1431 to 1442 A.D.

About No. 11 there is no difference in the MS., but the lith. ed. omits the word *bin*, son of, before Ahmad. Firishtah lith. ed. says Nāsir-ud-dīn, a slave, who usurped the throne, reigned for seven days and according to another account for half a day. Col. Briggs agrees. The Cambridge History of India, page 267, calls him Nāsir Khān, originally a slave, and later one of the principal officers of the State, who assumed the title of Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd and is said on page 267 to have reigned peacefully for seventeen years. In the list on page 695, he is said to have reigned from 1442 to 1460. About No. 12 there is no difference between the MSS. and the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. calls him Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn Shāh Bhaugara and says he ruled for thirty-two years. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 339) calls him Nasir Poorby, and says he reigned for two years. In the Cambridge History of India the Nāsir-ud-dīn and the Nāsir Shāh of the Tabaqāt and Firishtah are, apparently, made into one man. He is said on page 268 to have died in 1459, though in the list on page 695 he is said to have reigned from 1442 to 1460. As regards No. 13, one MS. calls him Bin Bārbak Shāh, but otherwise the MSS. and the lith. ed. agree. Firishtah lith. ed. and Col. Briggs (who, however, calls him Barbik Poorby) agree. The Cambridge History of India, page 268, calls him Rukn-ud-dīn Bārbak and says he succeeded his father in 1459 and died in 1474, and thus reigned for about fifteen years. On page 695 he is called Rukn-ud-dīn Bārbak Shāh and is said to have reigned from 1460 to 1474, or for about fourteen years. About No. 14 the MSS. and the lith. ed. agree; but the lith. ed. of Firishtah gives him seven years and six months, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 339) gives him between seven and eight years. The Cambridge History of India, page 268, calls him Shams-ud-dīn Yūsuf, who reigned for seven years from 1474 to 1481. There is much difference in the periods of No. 15's reign; one MS. and the lith. ed. have half a day, while the other MS. has two half years and two half days. The meaning of which is difficult to find out. Firishtah lith. ed. gives him two months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 340) says he was deposed on the day he was raised to the throne. The Cambridge History of India, page 268, also says that he was immediately deposed, as his intellect was deranged.

The name of No. 16 is omitted from one MS. I have given in the text what is written about him in the other MS. The lith. ed. calls him Fatih, without any

prefix or suffix; and gives him seven years and five months. *Firishtah* lith. ed. agrees with the lith. ed. of *Ṭabaqāt* in giving him a reign of seven years and five months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 340) calls him *Futtelī Poorby*, and says he was murdered after a reign of seven years. The *Cambridge History of India*, page 268, says he reigned from 1481 to 1486 (i.e., for five years), when he was assassinated. As to No. 17 both the MSS. and the lith. ed. have the reading I have in the text. *Firishtah* lith. ed. says *Bārbak Shāh* reigned according to one statement for eight months, and according to another for two and a half months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 341) calls him the Eunuch *Shahzada*, and says he reigned for two months. The *Cambridge History of India* calls him *Bārbak the Eunuch*, *Sultān Shāhizāda* in the list on page 696, and gives a rather long account of how he was killed on page 269, but does not mention the exact period of his reign. The MSS. and the lith. ed. agree as to No. 18, and say what I have translated in the text. *Firishtah* calls him *Malik Iudil Ḥabshī* who had the title of *Firūz Shāh* and says he ruled for three years. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 344) calls him *Mullik Andeel Feroze Poorby*, and says he ruled for thirteen years, apparently from 886 A.H. to 899 A.H. The corresponding A.D. period 1401 to 1493 is apparently incorrect. The *Cambridge History of India* does not mention the year of his accession on page 269, but says he reigned for two years and died in 1489. In the list of the kings on pp. 695, 696, the years of his accession and death are 1486 and 1489 respectively.

As to No. 19, the MSS. and the lith. ed. agree but there are slight mistakes. *Firishtah* lith. ed. calls him *Shāhī Maḥmūd Shāh*, and says he ruled for one year, but it also mentions a statement in the *History of Ḥājī Muḥammad Qandahārī*, according to which he ruled merely in name under the guardianship of *Ḥabīb Khān*, a slave of *Shāh Bārbak Shāh*, at the end of which *Ḥabīb Khān* wanted to rule himself, but he was slain by *Sidī Badr Diwana*, who also slew the infant king, and proclaimed himself as *Sultān Muzaḥfar Shāh*. Col. Briggs and the *Cambridge History of India* agree generally. The MSS. and the lith. ed. agree in saying what I have in the text in respect of No. 20. *Firishtah* calls him *Sidī Badr Ḥabshī* who had the title of *Muzaḥfar Shāh*, and says he reigned for three years and five months. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 348) says he reigned for three years. The *Cambridge History of India*, page 270, also says he reigned for three years, and in the list of kings he is said to have reigned from 1490 to 1493 A.D. The MSS. and the lith. ed. also agree about No. 21. *Firishtah* lith. ed. calls him *Sharīf Makki*, celebrated as *Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn*, and says he reigned for twenty-seven years. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 348) agrees as to the period of his reign, but calls him *Ala-ood-deen Poorby, II*. The *Cambridge History of India*, page 696, calls him *Saiyid 'Alā-ud-dīn Sharīf-i-Makki*, and says he reigned from 1493 to 1518, i.e., for twenty-five years. His full title, as can be gathered from his coins, is given on page 270 and the period of his reign is mentioned there also as twenty-five years. Neither of the MSS. gives the period of *Naṣīb Shāh's* reign. The lith. ed. calls him *Nāṣir Shāh* and gives him eleven days. *Firishtah* lith. ed. calls him *Shāhī Nāṣir Shāh*, and says he ascended the throne in 927 and died in 943, which would give him about sixteen years. Col. Briggs



<sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN FAKHR-UD-DĪN.

Malik Fakhr-ud-dīn was the *silāhdār* (armour bearer) of Qadr Khān. <sup>2</sup> He treacherously slew his master, and attributed the name of the *salṭanat* to himself. He <sup>3</sup> sent one of his slaves by the name of Mukhlis, with a well equipped army, to the frontier district of Bangāla (اقصى بنگاله). <sup>4</sup> But Malik 'Alī Mubārak, the pay master of Qadr

<sup>1</sup> One MS. inserts Shāh after Fakhr-ud-dīn.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah describes in some detail the way in which Qadr Khān was murdered by his own soldiers at the instigation of Fakhr-ud-dīn; and Stewart, *History of Bengal*, 1813, page 81, follows him. According to Stewart, Fakher Addeen proclaimed his independence at Sunergong about the end of 740 or the beginning of 741, and this is confirmed by his coins which also show that he continued to reign in Sōnārgāon till 750 A.H. This agrees generally with the list of Bengal Kings on page 695 of the Cambridge History of India, according to which he reigned from 739 A.H. to 750 A.H. The Cambridge History of India, page 262, differs from the Ṭabaqāt and from Firishtah and Stewart. According to it, Qadr Khān was not slain by or at the instigation of Fakhr-ud-dīn, as he died in 1339, and was succeeded by Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Alī as the Cambridge History of India calls him or Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Alī Shāh. It is doubtful whether Bahrām Khān, who had been associated with Ghiyās-ud-dīn Bahādur in the government of Eastern Bengal and since the latter's rebellion and death in 1330 was the sole governor of East Bengal, was or was not slain by Fakhr-ud-dīn: but it was after his death in 1336 that Fakhr-ud-dīn or Fakhr-ud-dīn Mubārak Shāh assumed the royal title at Sōnārgāon; but Qadr Khān did not die till 1339, i.e., three years later, at Lakhnautī.

<sup>3</sup> According to Firishtah and Stewart he was sent to conquer Lakhnautī and the neighbouring districts.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah agrees as to Malik 'Alī having defeated Mukhlis, but he says nothing about his defeating Fakhr-ud-dīn and putting him to death. Stewart (pp. 82, 83) agrees with the Ṭabaqāt, and says that Aly Mubarick defeated Fakher Addeen, and put him to death in 743 A.H., 1342-43 A.D. This cannot, however, be correct, as there are coins struck by him up to 749 A.H. in existence.

According to Firishtah, he was taken prisoner in 741 A.H. by Malik Iliyās, who assumed the title of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, and was brought to Lakhnautī where he was hanged by the neck. This also cannot be correct. The Cambridge History of India, page 262, says that hostilities continued between Eastern and Western Bengal till 1349 A.D., when Fakhr-ud-dīn disappeared from the scene; but he was succeeded by his son Ikhtiyār-ud-dīn Ghāzī Shāh at Sōnārgāon. This latter Sultān is not mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn or Firishtah or Stewart; but his coins show that he reigned at Sōnārgāon from 750 to 763 A.H., 1349-1352 A.D. (See Bhattasali's *Coins and Chronology of the Early Independent*

Khan's army, met him in battle, and slew him; and all his horses and other equipages which were with him fell into the victor's hands. As Sultān Fakhr-ud-dīn had only newly acquired his power, and had no faith in his followers, he could not attack 'Alī Mubārak. In the end Malik 'Alī Mubārak assumed the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn; and went and attacked Sultān Fakhr-ud-dīn; and in the year 941 A.H. having taken him prisoner alive, sentenced him to death. He then left a *thāna* (military post) at Lakhnautī, and returned to the country of Bangāla (probably Sōnārgāon).

The period of Sultān Fakhr-ud-dīn's rule was two years and some months.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN 'ALĀ'-UD-DĪN.

As he had put Sultān Fakhr-ud-dīn to death, he with great strength left a *thāna* at Lakhnautī and <sup>1</sup> advanced towards Bangāla. <sup>2</sup> After

*Sultans of Bengal*, 1922, pages 18, 19, and the Cambridge History of India, pp. 262, 695.) He is also mentioned by Edward Thomas, *The Chronicles of the Pathān Kings of Delhi*, 1871, pages 265, 266, and is included in Lane-Poole's list in *The Mohammadan Dynasties*, 1925, page 307.

<sup>1</sup> The meaning is not clear. Firishtah and Stewart are of no help. The former merely copies the words of the Ṭabaqāt, and the latter says nothing whatever about 'Alā-ud-dīn. It appears, however, from Bhattasali, page 15, and the Cambridge History of India, page 262, that 'Alā-ud-dīn at this time removed his capital to Pandūah for strategic reasons. The *diyār* Bangāla would therefore mean Pandūah.

<sup>2</sup> There is a good deal of difference in the readings in the MSS. and the lith. ed.; and they are all more or less incorrect. One MS. has حاجي الياس علائى كه در لشكر لکهنوتي نامرد بوده، لشکر را بخود بارو موافق ساخته سلطان علائ الدين را کشت و خود را سلطان شمس الدين لقب گذاشته و چون سلطان علائ الدين ديار حاجي الياس علائى the other MS. has instead of علائى, حاجي الياس علائى, and instead of ساخته, ساخت; and omits the words from و خود ديار لکهنوتي و بنگاله بتصرف گرديد. The lith. ed. omits لشکر before لکهنوتي, and has فرموده instead of بوده after نامرد; and گذاشت instead of گذاشته after لقب in the reading in the first MS.; and inserts the words کشته شد after سلطان علائ الدين, and بازير instead of ديار before لکهنوتي. The reading in the lith. ed. of Firishtah is somewhat different.

a few days, Malik <sup>1</sup> Ḥājī Iliyās 'Alāī, who had been nominated (for the office of Sultān) in the army of Lakhnautī, made that army friendly and united with him; and slew Sultān 'Alā'-ud-dīn, and giving himself the title of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn *Bhangara*, took possession of the country of Lakhnautī and Bangāla. The period of the government of Sultān 'Alā'-ud-dīn was one year and some months.

<sup>2</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF ḤAJI ILIYĀS, WHO HAD THE TITLE OF SULTĀN SHAMS-UD-DĪN *Bhangara*.

When 'Alā-ud-dīn was slain and the whole country of Lakhnautī and Bangāla came into the possession of Iliyās, he in concert with the *amīrs* gave himself the title of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn; and had public prayers read in his name. He made very great efforts in obtaining the good wishes of the people and in attracting the hearts of the soldiers.

After some time he equipped an army, and marched to <sup>3</sup> Jājnagar; and having obtained many large elephants from that country, returned

I have adopted the reading in the first MS. changing گذاشته to گذاشت, and inserting the words سلطان علاء الدین کشته شد after سلطان علاء الدین. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has generally followed the second MS. in the text-edition.

<sup>1</sup> The relationship of Malik Ḥājī Iliyās with Sultān 'Alā'-ud-dīn, and their antecedent as detailed in the *Riyāzu-s-Salātīn* are given on pages 19, 20 of Bhattasali's book. I do not think that Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah are correct in saying that Malik Ḥājī Iliyās gave himself the title of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn *Bhangara*. The last word was a nick name popularly given to him on account of his addiction to the preparation of hemp known as *Bhang*. According to Firishtah Ḥājīpūr opposite to Patna got its name from Ḥājī Iliyās.

<sup>2</sup> The heading given in the text is that in the MSS. with the slight difference that the last word is داشت in one MS. and گذاشته in the other. The latter is correct. The heading in the lith. ed. is ذکر سلطان شمس الدین بهنگر .

<sup>3</sup> Neither the *Riyāzu-s-Salātīn* nor the *Ṭabaqāt* nor Firishtah attempts to identify this place. Bhattasali (pp. 24, 25) says, Sultan Shamsuddin "seems to have levied tribute from the kingdoms of Orissa and Tirhut", from which it appears that he identifies Jājnagar with Orissa. The Cambridge History of India, page 263, says "Iliyās is said to have invaded Jājnagar, as the Muslim historians styled the kingdom of Jājpur in Orissa". There is no connected account of this kingdom anywhere in the Cambridge History of India, and it is only mentioned incidentally in this place, and in connection





Shams-ud-dīn took shelter in the fort of <sup>1</sup> Ekdāla, and <sup>2</sup> left the whole country of Bangāla unoccupied (i.e., unguarded).

When Sultān Firūz heard, that Sultān Shams-ud-dīn had fortified himself in Ekdāla, he advanced from the road towards that place. When he arrived in its neighbourhood, Sultān Shams-ud-dīn sallied out of the fort, and engaged in a regular battle, and many were slain on both sides. Sultān Shams-ud-dīn fled, and again took shelter in Ekdāla. The large elephants, which he had brought from Jājnagar, fell into the hands of Sultān Firūz Shāh's men.

As the rains had commenced, and there was heavy rain, Sultān Firūz Shāh returned on the 1st of Rabī'ul-āwwal to Dehli. After that in the year 755 A.H. Sultān Shams-ud-dīn sent a large quantity of tribute, such as might be fit for the <sup>3</sup> Sultān with his ambassadors, as homage to Firūz Shāh, and prayed for pardon. Sultān Firūz Shāh also, behaving with kindness conferred robes of honour on the ambassadors; and granted them permission to <sup>4</sup> depart.

Again about the end of the <sup>5</sup> year 759 A.H., Sultān Shams-ud-dīn sent Malik Tāj-ud-dīn to Dehli with much tribute; and Sultān Firūz

<sup>1</sup> As to the position of Ekdāla, see the excellent note 2 on page 100 of the English translation of the Riāzu-s-Salātīn. Zia 'Barnī says: "It is the name of a *mouza* close to Panduah; on one side of it is a river and on another a jungle". Shams-i-Siraj calls it "The isles of Ekdalah". I may note here that the name is transliterated in the Cambridge History of India, page 263, as Ekdāla. No Indian will, however, pronounce the name with an initial I.

<sup>2</sup> The Riāzu-s-Salātīn (p. 100), however, says that Sultān Shams-ud-dīn left his son with an army in the fort of Panduah. The son, however, was soon taken prisoner. According to the Riāz also there was a great battle on the day Firūz Shāh arrived near Ekdāla, after which the siege was continued for twenty-two days.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. inserts *مجلس* before *سلاطين*. Firishtah lith. ed. also has *لايق مجلس بادشاهان*.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. has *انصرف* by mistake for *انصراف*.

<sup>5</sup> The Riāzu-s-Salātīn has 758 A.H. 759 A.H. appears to be incorrect. Bhattasali (pp. 41-45) enters into a long disquisition on the subject, and comes to the conclusion that Sultan Shamsuddin died about the end of Zul-hijjah 758. The Cambridge History of India, page 263, discusses the question as to whether or not Firūz acknowledged the independence of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn. It comes to the conclusion that Firūz Shāh had to return without obtaining a formal declaration of Shams-ud-dīn's homage. It also says that the tributes

Shāh treated the ambassador with greater kindness than before; and after some days, sent 'Arab and Turkī horses with other fine presents for Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, with Malik Sāif-ud-dīn, the superintendent of the elephants. Malik Sāif-ud-dīn and Malik Tāj-ud-dīn had not yet passed through Behār, when Sultān Shams-ud-dīn died. Malik Sāif-ud-dīn <sup>1</sup> gave the horses to the *amīrs* of Behār, in accordance with the emperor's order; and <sup>2</sup> Malik Sāif-ud-dīn himself went back to Dehli.

The period of the rule of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn was sixteen years and some months.

### <sup>3</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF SULTĀN SIKANDAR SHĀH, SON OF SULTĀN SHAMS-UD-DĪN.

When Sultān Shams-ud-dīn <sup>4</sup> departed (this life), the *amīrs* and the chiefs of the different groups, on the third day after his death,

---

sent by Shams-ud-dīn in 755 A.H., 1354 A.D. and 758 A.H., 1358 A.D. were merely the customary exchanges of presents; but it should be noted in both instances that the presents or tributes were sent from Bengāl. It appears to me that the relations between the two rulers remained undefiant; and I cannot find any evidence in support of the statement made in the Cambridge History of India (p. 263) that "In December, 1356, Firūz formally recognised the independence of Bengal".

<sup>1</sup> The *Riyāzu-s-Salātin* (text-edition, p. 99) says: در عوض مواجب سپاهیان i.e., in lieu of the pay due to the imperial soldiers stationed in Behār.

<sup>2</sup> Both MSS. have Malik Tāj-ud-dīn instead of Malik Sāif-ud-dīn. This is incorrect.

<sup>3</sup> There are slight differences in the heading. It is as I have it in the text in one MS. In the other MS. it is simply ذکر سکندر شاه. The lith. ed. has the same heading as the first MS., with the exception that it omits the word سلطان سکندر شاه after.

<sup>4</sup> One MS. has رحلت نمود instead of رحلت نمود. The relations between the rulers of Dehli and Bengal at this time are extremely obscure. The *Riyāzu-s-Salātin*, the *Ṭabaqāt* and *Firishtah* all begin abruptly by saying that Sultān Sikandar considered it extremely important to conciliate Firūz Shāh, without saying anything about the relations between Sultān Shams-ud-dīn and Firūz Shāh, after the latter's first expedition to Bengāl. According to the *Tarikh-i-Firūz Shāhi* by Shams-Sirāj Afif, the object of the second expedition was to reinstate Zafar Khān on the throne of Sōnārgāon, but that work is also silent about the relation between Firūz Shāh and Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, just before the latter's death. According to Bhattasali (p. 44) after the experi-

placed his eldest son on the throne of empire, giving him the title of Sikandar Shāh. He proclaimed the gospel of justice and beneficence,

ences of his first expedition to Lakhnaūti. Fīroz Shah was in no mood again to interfere in the internal affairs of Bengal; but he had to take cognisance of the complaint of Zafar Khan, who arrived in Dehli in 758 A.H., as he was the latter's liege lord; but he was, at least according to Bhattasali, apparently afraid of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn; and it was not till the news of the latter's death had come to Dehli, that he finally made up his mind, and began to prepare for marching against the unsuspecting Sikandar. Bhattasali (p. 48) goes on to say that, according to the Riyāz and Firishtah, Sikandar was ignorant of the motive of Fīroz Shah in thus hurrying towards Bengal, even when Fīroz reached Zafarabad (near Jaunpur). I do not consider this latter statement correct. Even immediately after his accession Sikandar knew that it was extremely important for him to conciliate Fīrūz Shāh. This is expressly mentioned in the Riyāz and the Ṭabaqāt and by Firishtah. As to Sikandar's not knowing the motive of Fīrūz Shāh's march towards Bengal (Fīrūz was certainly not hurrying, for taking the dates given by Bhattasali himself, he commenced his preparations in 759 A.H., started in Muḥarram 760 A.H., and arrived in Jaunpūr about Jamādī-ul-āwwal 760 A.H., and halted there for six months, and the siege of Ekdāla did not commence till Zi qa'da 760, and did not end till Jamādī-ul-āwwal 761 A.H. This snail-like march contrasts very unfavourably with the first expedition, in the course of which Fīrūz Shāh reached Ekdāla in three days less than five months after leaving Dehli) he must have been both very ignorant and very dense. It is not quite correct to say that the Riyāz and Firishtah say that Sikandar was ignorant of Fīrūz Shāh's motive, even when the latter arrived at Zafarābād. The former says that he was متردد or anxious, but that does not mean that he was ignorant. Firishtah does not even say this.

The Cambridge History of India, page 263, gives a different view of the matter. According to it, in December 1356 A.D., as already noted, Fīrūz formally recognised the independence of Bengal, but apparently he intended to treat this recognition as so much waste paper. He accordingly as soon as the news of the death of Shams-ud-dīn reached him, ordered the gifts to the latter to be distributed among the nobles of Bihar, and recalled Saif-ud-dīn to assist in the preparation for an invasion of Bengal. I do not know what the authority for this statement is. None of the chroniclers or historians say so. But though Fīrūz Shāh wanted to brush aside his declaration of December 1356 A.D., he was apparently unable to do so, without a pretext; and this was furnished by the arrival of Zafar Khān.

It is unnecessary to labour this point further. I consider that Fīrūz Shāh thought that he was entitled to reannex Bengal to the empire of Dehli, and he made a second attempt to do so.

and occupied himself with the duties of the *salṭanat*. Knowing that seeking the pleasure of the heart of Sultān Firūz Shāh was of the greatest importance, he sent fifty elephants and various stuffs in the way of tribute to Sultān Firūz Shāh. In the meanwhile, the latter had advanced towards Lakhnauti in the year 760 A.H. with the object of conquering Bangāla. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Pāndūa, Sultān Sikandar following the example of his father, fortified himself in his citadel of Ekdāla. <sup>1</sup> As he had not the strength to oppose him (i.e., Firūz Shāh), he agreed to pay an annual tribute and turned the Sultān back. The latter was yet in the neighbourhood of Pandūa, when Sikandar sent thirty-seven elephants and many valuable things and various kinds of stuff to the Sultān, and prayed for the pardon of his offences. Then following the example of his father, he passed the whole of his life in pleasure and <sup>2</sup> enjoyment. The period of his rule

<sup>1</sup> The *Riyāzu-s-Salātīn* and *Firishtah* agree. Stewart (p. 85) also agrees, but he says that Emperor Ferose found out that there was no probability of his being able to capture Akdala. Bhattasali (pp. 59, 51) says Sultan Firoz returned discomfited and says, that he and not Sultan Sikandar sought for peace. It appears, however, that proposals for peace were sent by Sikandar's ministers, who took their master's silence to imply his consent to their being sent; and Firoz's ministers received them with great joy, and had no difficulty in persuading their masters to listen to them. Firoz, however, stipulated for the restoration of Sonargaon to Zafar Khan, but the latter did not dare to resume sovereignty in the dangerous proximity of Sikandar.

The Cambridge History of India, page 264, practically agrees with the above.

<sup>2</sup> The *Ṭabaqāt* and *Firishtah* are silent about some very important incidents of the life of Sikandar. The *Riyāzu-s-Salātīn* (p. 105) mentions them. One of these is the erection of the Adina Mosque in Panduah, which is perhaps the finest and most remarkable religious edifice in Bengal. Unfortunately it remained unfinished at the time of his death.

The second is the rebellion of *Ḡhiyāṣu-d-dīn*, who afterwards succeeded him. It is said that Sikandar had two wives, one of whom had seventeen sons, while *Ḡhiyāṣu-d-dīn* was the only son of the other. The latter, in the words of the *Riyāzu-s-Salātīn* (text-edition, pp. 101-104) was *در حسن اخلاق و جمیع اوصاف بر همه برادران فایق و در امور سلطنت و جهانداري انب و لایق* which may be translated as superior to all his brothers in the beauty of his morals and in all (good) qualities, and the fittest and most meritorious in the arts of sovereignty. His step-mother, however, complained to the Sultān against him, and suggested that he should either be put into prison, or deprived of his



to his son and seated him on the throne in the place of his father. He also following the rule of his father and the custom of his grandfather passed the whole of his life in pleasure and enjoyment; and <sup>1</sup> in the year 775 A.H. passed away from the narrow place of the body to the wide spaces of the spirit.

The period of his rule was seven <sup>2</sup> years and some months.

After his recovery, when he was in a jovial mood the Sultān recited the line: سَأَتِي حَدِيثَ سِرْوِوْغُلٍ وَلَالَهُ مِيرُود. None of the court poets could make another line to match it; so the Sultān sent it to Hāfiz by a special messenger. The latter quickly sent the second line: أَيْنَ يَحْثُ بِالْأَلْفِ غَالَهُ مِيرُود. He also sent a whole *ghazl* (ode) beginning with these lines. The Sultān sent him many valuable presents, and invited him to his court; but Hāfiz could not come. The word *ghasāla* also means a morning draught, so the double entendre is extremely witty (vide Cambridge History of India, pp. 264, 265, and Riyāz, p. 109).

Another anecdote also shows the Sultān in a pleasing light. He is said to have wounded the only son of a widow while practising with his bow and arrow. The widow went and complained to Qāḍī Strāj-ad-dīn. The latter summoned the Sultān to appear before him. The officer sent to serve the summons could not get admission into the palace; but he used the device of calling the *odhān*. The Sultān ordered the man who had made this untimely call to be brought before him. When the man was brought to him, he produced the summons. The Sultān at once went with him, taking a short sword under his arm. When he appeared before the Qāḍī, the latter told him to satisfy the widow. The Sultān did so, and when on the Qāḍī's asking the widow, she stated that she was quite satisfied, the Qāḍī rose from his seat, and seated the Sultān on the *manād*. The Sultān then eulogized the Qāḍī, but producing the sword, said that if he had found the Qāḍī afraid to administer justice he would have cut off his head with it. The Qāḍī then produced a scourge which he had kept concealed under his *manād*; and said that if he had found the Sultān unwilling to satisfy the widow, he would have sacrificed his back with it. As the Cambridge History of India (p. 265) says, "Bengal can boast of a prince more law abiding than Henry of Monmouth, and of a judge at least as firm as Gascoigne".

<sup>1</sup> This also is incorrect. He actually reigned from 795 A.H., 1393 A.D., to 813 A.H., 1410 A.D., or for seventeen or eighteen years. The Riyāz (p. 111) gives seven years and some months as the period of his reign, but adds that according to another account it lasted for sixteen years, five months and three days.

<sup>2</sup> According to the Riyāz, page 111, he was slain by deceit and treachery by Rāja Kāns who was a zemindar of the neighbourhood.

<sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN-US-SALĀTĪN.

<sup>2</sup> When Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn departed (from the world), the *amīrs* raised his son on the throne of the empire, giving him the title of Sultān-us-salātīn. He was a merciful and patient and brave ruler; and went away in the year 795 from the waste place of this world to the populous country of the next life.

He reigned for ten years.

<sup>3</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN SHAMS-UD-DIN.

As Sultān-us-salātīn went from the house of this world to the house of the after life, the *amīrs* and the chief men of the State gave the

<sup>1</sup> That is the heading in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the Riyāz, p. 111, he is called Saif-ud-dīn, who had the title of Sultānu-s-salātīn.

<sup>2</sup> The account of this reign in the Riyāz, pages 111, 112, agrees generally with the text, but it says that, according to one account, his reign lasted for three years, seven months and five days and not ten days. Firishtah also agrees, but says the *amīrs* and *vazīrs* were amazed (در حساب بودند), where حساب is probably a mistake for حیرت, and he never strayed towards خلاف (? opposition to the *Shara'*); and the Rāys of the country around never drew their heads from the circle of his obedience, and never made any delay or objection in paying the proper revenue. Firishtah also says in one place that he carried on the government for ten years, but in another place he says the period of his rule was seven years and some months. Col. Briggs's account (vol. IV, p. 335) agrees with that in the text, and not with that in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. According to Bhattachali (page 90) Saifuddin was king only in name. The real power seems to have passed to Raja Ganesh. He also comes to the conclusion after considering his coins and the synchronisms of the Chinese Annals, that his reign lasted only for one year and some months in 813 A.H., and the whole of 814 A.H. (p. 98). According to the Cambridge History of India, page 266, he is said to have peacefully succeeded his father, to have had an obscure reign, to have been defeated in 1404 by Ganesh but to have continued to reign till his death in 1406.

<sup>3</sup> The heading is as I have it in the text in the MSS. In the lith ed. it is ذکر بر سلطان السلاطین یعنی سلطان شمس الدین. Firishtah also calls the son and successor of Saif-ud-dīn, Hamzā Shāh or Sultān-us-salātīn, Sultān Shams-ud-dīn II. In the heading in the Riyāz, p. 112, he is also called Sultān Shamsu-d-dīn, son of Sultānu-s-salātīn; but it is stated a few lines further down that Shamsu-d-dīn was not the son but the adopted son of Sultānu-s-salātīn; and his name was Shahābu-d-dīn and not Shamsu-d-dīn. It goes on to say that Rajah Kāns attacked and slew him and assumed the name of Sultān. It appears to be uncertain, as far as our present information goes, as to what the actual political



title of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn to his son; and placed him on the <sup>1</sup> throne of the empire. He also following the custom of his ancestors passed his whole life in pleasure; and in the year 790 A.H., he passed away.

The period of his reign was three years and some months.

## <sup>2</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF RĀJA KĀNS.

When Sultān Shams-ud-dīn died, a *zamīndār* of the name of Kāns acquired power and dominion over the country of Bangāla. As the just and holy God <sup>3</sup> was kind to his son, the latter became a Musalmān and sat on the throne.

situation in Bengal was at the time, *i.e.*, between 813 and 810 A.H.: but it appears that Shamsu-d-dīn or Shahābu-d-dīn was only a king in name and the entire authority was vested on Raja Ganesh or Kāns of Bhaduria. He appears, according to Bhattasali (p. 99), to have been supported on the throne by the Raja as harmless, and not likely to interfere with his own authority, and also to keep down the legitimate Ilyas Shahis. The Cambridge History of India, page 366, says that Saif-ud-dīn Hamza Shāh was succeeded by Shams-ud-dīn, who was permitted to ascend the throne but exercised no power; and died after a reign of little more than three years. He was succeeded by another puppet Shihāb-ud-dīn Bāyazīd. In the list of the kings of Bengal on page 695 the name of Shams-ud-dīn does not appear at all; but Shihāb-ud-dīn Bāyazīd succeeded him in 815, and appears to have reigned for two years. The two accounts contradict each other. The account on page 266 appears to be incorrect. Shamsu-d-dīn and Shahābu-d-dīn, which are two names given in the Riyāz, page 112, to the same man, have been given to two men, one of whom did not exist at all. It may be mentioned, however, that Lane-Poole has both Shams-al-dīn and Shihāb-al-dīn in his list on page 307.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have اورنگ, but the other MS. has ارانگ.

<sup>2</sup> The heading is as I have it in the text in one MS. In the other MS. it is simply راجہ کانس. In the lith. ed. it is ذکر حکومت کانس.

<sup>3</sup> The readings are slightly different. The reading in the MS. is not very clear, but appears to be شر اورا کفایت کرد; the meaning of which is not at all clear. The lith. ed. has very distinctly پسر اورا کفایت کرد the meaning of which is also obscure. کفایت کردن means to suffice, to serve, to do, also to spare. The meaning of the reading in the MSS. may be "undid his wickedness"; and that of the reading in the lith. ed., "was kind to his son"; but I am not sure of either of these.

The Ṭabaqāt gives no information of as to the events of the reign of the Kāns or Ganesh; and of his attitude towards the Musalmāns. The Riyāz, p. 113, says he persecuted them, and murdered many of them, including many

The period of the power of Kāns was seven years.

learned and holy men, such as Shaikh Badrul Islām, son of Shaikh M'uīnu-d-dīn 'Abbas. Then the saintly Nūr Qutbu-l-'Alam wrote to Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqī to come and invade Bengāl, and save the Musalmans of the country from the persecution of this cruel and inhuman *kafir*. Ibrāhīm Sharqī accordingly invaded Bengal, and encamped at Firnzpur (i.e., Panduah). Kāns then went to the saint, and begged him to intercede in his favour so that Sultān Ibrāhīm might go back. The saint refused to do so, unless he consented to accept Islām; but his wife refused to allow him to do so. Upon this he brought his son, Jadū, who was then twelve years of age, and said, I have now become too old and have little to do with this world; but I have brought my son, and offer him as a proselyte to Islam. Then the saint took some *pān* which he was chewing out of his mouth and put it into the boy's mouth; and made him recite the creed of Musalman faith. After that he persuaded Sultān Ibrāhīm, much against his will, to go back to Jaampur; where he died shortly after this. After his death Kāns again commenced his persecution of the Musalmans. He also tried to make Jadū a Hindu again, by passing him through a golden image of a cow, portions of which were afterwards given to Brahmans. He commenced to persecute and kill the servants and relations of Nūr Qutbu-l-'Alam himself. He even put the son of the saint, who was named Shaikh Anwar, to death; but he himself died at the very time when Shaikh Anwar became a martyr (pp. 113-116).

The account given by Firishtah is entirely different. According to it although Rājā Kāns never became a Musalmān, he mixed much with, and had great love for the followers of the faith, so much so, that many believed him to have become a Musalmān, and wanted to bury his dead body.

The account in the Riyāz has been accepted by historians in preference to that of Firishtah. It appears from Bhattasālī's account (pp. 117-122) that it is substantially correct; the only serious mistake in it, being the statement that Ganesh or Kāns resumed sovereign power after the death of Sultan Ibrāhīm Sharqī. As a matter of fact Sultan Ibrāhīm Sharqī died long after the death of Rājā Ganesh, which took place in 821 A.H., 1418 A.D., which is the last coin of Danujamarādāna Deva (title assumed by Ganesh after his second accession); and also of Mahendra Deva's coins from Pandua and Chittagong. Mahendra Deva was the title assumed by Judu or Jalaluddin, after his second accession, after the death of his father, and before his second conversion to Islam. Sultan Ibrāhīm Sharqī died in 840 A.H., 1436 A.D. It would appear that Ganesh resumed his power after the death of Nur-Kutab 'Alam, when he began his second persecution of the Musalmāns, and banished and afterwards put to death Nur-Kutab 'Alam's son Shaikh Anwar. After this he assumed the title of Danujamarādāna Deva; and coins were struck by him in 820 A.H., in Chittagong, Sonargaon and Pandua, and in 821 A.H., in Pandua have been.

<sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN JALĀL-UD-DĪN, SON OF KĀNS.

As Kāns went to his original abode (i.e., I suppose hell), his <sup>2</sup> son, owing to his love of rule became a Musalmān, and assumed the name of Sultān Jalāl-ud-dīn. The people were contented and happy during his time; and at the end of the year 812 <sup>3</sup> A.H. he passed away.

The period of his reign was seventeen years.

found. Coins of Mahendra Deva bearing the date 821 A.H., and struck at Pandna and Chittagong have also been found.

The Cambridge History of India (pp. 266, 267) agrees generally with Bhattasali; but it does not mention Damjamarddana Dēva or Mahendra Deva; and according to it Ganesh died in 817 A.H., 1414 A.D.; and Jadū or Jalāl-ud-dīn succeeded him in that year.

<sup>1</sup> There are slight differences in the heading. The heading in the text is that in the lith. ed. One MS. has the same heading up to بن bin, but has left out the word Kāns by mistake. The other MS. has simply an account of Sultān Jalāl-ud-dīn.

<sup>2</sup> Both MSS. omit the word <sup>پسر</sup> after <sup>او</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> The year in both MSS. is <sup>اثنى عشر و ثمانمائة</sup>. The lith. ed. has <sup>اثنى عشر و ثمانمائة</sup>. Both are incorrect. He died in 834 or 835 A.H. Some account of him has been given in note 2, page 859 of the type-script. The *Ṭabaqāt* says: the people were contented and happy in his reign. The *Riyāz*, p. 118, gives a different account. According to it he converted many infidels to Islām, and forced the *Brahmans* who had partaken of portions of the golden image of the cow to eat beef. He became a disciple of *Shāikh Zāhid*, grandson of *Nūr Quṭb-i-ʿAlam*, and nephew of *Shāikh Anwar*. It is also said, of course, that people were happy and contented; and the population of Panduah became very large; and he erected a mosque, etc., in Gaur; and the re-population of Gaur commenced in his time.

*Firishtah's* account is different. He gives him the name of Jaimal and says that he offered to abdicate in favour of his younger brother, if the chief men of the country objected to him, on the ground of his being a Musalmān; but they in an extremely tolerant way said, that religion did not in any way affect worldly affairs. According to *Firishtah* also he became the *Nūshīrwān* of the age, i.e., the ideally just ruler.

*Bhattasali* (p. 112) says he became zealous Muhammadan, converted many to the Musalman Faith, recalled *Shāikh Zāhid* from Sonargaon and showed him every respect. He also quotes *Firishtah's* account; and it appears that the copy of *Firishta* from which he quoted gives Jeetmal as his Hindu name.

The Cambridge History of India, page 267, says: "He persecuted the Hindus, as his father had persecuted the Muslims.....and hosts of

<sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN AḤMAD, SON OF SULTĀN JALĀL-UD-DĪN.

As the inevitable happened to Sultān Jalāl-ud-dīn, the *amīrs*

Hindus are said to have been forcibly converted to Islam". It also considers it probable that the present "numerical superiority of Muslims in Eastern Bengal is due to an immense wave of proselytisation, (which) must have swept over the country, and it is most probable that the period was the reign of Jalāl-ud-dīn Muhammad".

It appears to me, however, that the numerical superiority of the Musalmāns in Eastern Bengal exists chiefly among Musalmāns of the lower classes; and low caste Hindūs (many of whom were untouchables) did not require much persuasion or persecution to accept a religion, according to which they might claim equality with the best.

<sup>1</sup> The heading is as I have it in the text in one MS. and in the lith. ed. In the other MS. Aḥmad Shāh is substituted for Sultān Aḥmad. As to the events of this reign Firishtah copies the Ṭabaqāt word for word, but unfortunately adds a few words of his own, which are totally opposed to the facts as given by the Riyāz. These words are: *اونيز پيروي پدر بزرگوار نموده بداد و دهمش کوشیده خلايق بسيار را غريق انعام و احسان گردانيد*. Stewart (p. 96) agrees with Firishtah as to the impartial administration of justice by Ahmed Shah; and adds that both "the followers of Mohammed and the worshippers of idols vied in their attachment to his person". He also says that during his reign Sultan Ibrahim of Joannpore invaded Bengal, and plundered several districts, and carried away many of the inhabitants as slaves. Ahmed Shah unable to contend with him sent an ambassador to Shah Rookh, the son of Timour at Herat. The latter wrote a letter to Sultan Ibrahim, threatening exemplary vengeance, if he did not immediately release the captives, and again molested the King of Bengal. After that Sultan Ibrahim never again invaded Bengal. An extract from Shah Rookh's letter is given by Stewart, who says the letter is taken from Firishtah and adds that the circumstances of the embassy are also confirmed in the "*Mutlaḥ Asṣadiq*", a very eloquent Persian history of Shah Rookh.

There is no mention of the letter in Firishtah lith. ed.; or in Col. Briggs's history; and no mention of this invasion of Bengal by Sultān Ibrāhīm, in any other history.

The Riyāz, pages 118, 119, gives a very different account of Aḥmad Shāh. He was very harsh tempered, tyrannical and blood-thirsty, and shed unrighteous blood; and used to cut open the bodies of pregnant women. When his barbarities reached an extreme point, two of his slaves Shādi Khān and Nāsir Khān, who had attained to the rank of nobility, conspired together, and brought about his death.

Bhattachali's account terminates with the history of Jalaluddin.

The Cambridge History of India says little is known of his reign, and then mentions the aggressions of Ibrāhīm Shargī, and the remonstrance of Shāh-

bestowed the <sup>1</sup> title of Sultān Aḥmad on his son and made him the successor of his father. <sup>2</sup> In the end of the year 830 A.H., he sought <sup>3</sup> release from bodily restraints and joined the spiritual existence.

The period of his reign was sixteen years.

#### <sup>4</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF NĀSIR THE SLAVE.

<sup>5</sup> When the throne of sovereignty remained unoccupied after the death of Sultān Aḥmad, son of Jalāl-ud-dīn, a slave of his named Nāsir placed his foot with great audacity on the throne of the empire, and commenced to issue all orders. The *amīrs* and *Maliks* of Sultān Aḥmad put him to death; and raised one of the grandsons of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn *Bhangara* to be the ruler.

The period of his rule was seven days, and, according to another account, half a day.

#### <sup>6</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF NĀSIR SHĀH.

When Nāsir *Ghulām* (the slave) was put to death, they found out one of the descendants of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn *Bhangara*, and placing him on the throne of the empire <sup>7</sup> gave him the title of Nāsir

rukḥ; and goes on to say that towards the end of his reign his tyranny, became unbearable; and he was put to death by Shādi Khān and Nāsir Khān. Nāsir Khān forestalled his fellow conspirator, and put him to death and assumed the sovereignty of Bengal (p. 267).

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has *قرار*, by mistake, for *خطاب*.

<sup>2</sup> Both MSS. have *واخر در سنه*; while the lith. ed. has *در آخر سنه*. I have retained the reading in the lith. ed.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. has *خلاص*, the other omits the word by mistake; while the lith. ed. has *خلامی*. I have accepted *خلاص*.

<sup>4</sup> The reading in one MS. is as I have it in the text. In the other MS. Nāsir-ud-dīn is substituted for Nāsir. The lith. ed. has *ذكر حكومت ناصر الدين* an account of the rule of Nāsir-ud-dīn.

<sup>5</sup> The Rīyāz, Firishtah, Col. Briggs and Stewart all agree generally. The Cambridge History of India, page 267, contrary to all the other authorities, makes Nāsir the slave and Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd one and the same person. Lane-Poole (p. 308) also has Nāsir-al-dīn Mahmūd Shāh II. who was apparently the slave, and also the first Sultān of the house of *Iliyās* (restored) apparently as one and the same person.

<sup>6</sup> The heading in the text is the heading in both MSS. The lith. ed. inserts the word *حکومت*, rule, before Nāsir Shāh.

<sup>7</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have *دادند*, but the other MS. has *داد*.

Shāh. All classes of men, common and noble, and great and small were happy and contented in the cradle of peace and safety. And in the end, in the year 862 A.H., he passed away.

The period of his reign was <sup>1</sup> two years.

## <sup>2</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF BĀRBĀK SHĀH.

When Nāsir Shāh died, the *amīrs* and the great men of the country seated Bārbak Shāh on the throne of sovereignty. In his time the residents of the city and the soldiery were in a state of contentment. He also passed his time in pleasure and enjoyment. When the period of his life and the days of his existence came to an end, in the year 879 A.H., he <sup>3</sup> passed away.

---

<sup>1</sup> Both the MSS. and the lith. ed. have two years. This is manifestly incorrect. The period from 830 A.H., the year of the death of Sultān Ahmad to 862 A.H., the year of Nāsir Shāh's death is thirty-two years. The *دو* in the text is a mistake for *سی و دو* or 32. The accounts of this reign, as given in the *Riyāz* and by Firishtah, Col. Briggs and Stewart generally agree with the text. The *Riyāz*, page 120, adds that he erected some of the buildings, and the fort of Gaur. As to the length of his reign, he says that it was thirty-two years, but according to others did not exceed twenty-seven years. Stewart (p. 100) also says that he constructed the fortification round the city of Gour.

As to the Cambridge History of India, see note on page 416. According to it the period of his reign was seventeen years from 846 to 864 A.H., 1442 to 1460 A.D.

<sup>2</sup> The heading in both MSS. is as I have in the text. The lith. ed. inserts the word *sultanat* before Bārbak Shāh. The *Riyāz* (text-edition, p. 118) agrees generally as to the account of this reign, but adds *مرد دانشمند و متشرع بود*. It appears from a note on page 120 of Salam's translation of the *Riyāz* that his full name was Rukn-d-dīn Abul Mujahid Barbak Shāh, that he reigned from 864 A.H., and that before that he was governor of south-west Bengal in 860 A.H. Firishtah copies the *Ṭabaqāt* as regards the early part of the account, but adds that he was the first sovereign of India who employed Abyssinians and raised them to high rank. Neither the Cambridge History of India nor Stewart has anything new about him; but both mention his employment of the Abyssinians. The Cambridge History of India (p. 269) says he reigned from 1459 to 1474 A.D., or for fifteen years.

<sup>3</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have *رحلت نمود*; but the other MS. has *شروع در مرحله پیمائی عالم نیستی کرد*. This MS. is very imperfect here. The words quoted are taken from the latter part of the accounts of the reign of Yūsuf Shāh, the next Sultān, the earlier part of the account of whose reign is altogether omitted in it.

The period of his reign was <sup>1</sup> seventeen years.

## <sup>2</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF YŪSUF SHĀH.

After the death of Bārbak Shāh, the *amīrs* and the well-known men of the kingdom placed Yūsuf Shāh on the throne of government. He was a patient *būdshāh* and a well-wisher of his subjects, and of a virtuous disposition. He began to measure the stages to the world of non-existence (*i.e.*, died) in the year 887 A.H.

The period of his sovereignty was seven years and six months.

## <sup>3</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SIKANDAR SHĀH.

<sup>4</sup> After the death of Yūsuf Shāh, <sup>5</sup> the *amīrs* and *vazīrs* placed

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has ten years. The other has عفت سال و شش (omitting the word عا) which was the period of the reign of Yūsuf Shāh. The lith. ed. has seventeen years which is correct and which I have adopted.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. omits the heading and the first part of the account of this reign, and joins the latter part on to the account of the reign of Bārbak Shāh. See note on page 416. The other MSS. have the heading which I have in the text. The lith. ed. inserts the word حكومت before Yūsuf Shāh.

The account of this reign in the *Ṭabaqāt* appears to be copied from the *Ḥayāt* (text-edition, p. 119) which adds the virtues of being صاحب علم و ریاضت, *i.e.*, learned and abstemious, to those mentioned in the *Ṭabaqāt*, and explains خبر خواسته by adding the word خلق. His full name appears to have been Shams-ud-din Abul Muẓaffar Yūsuf Shāh; and he appears to have reigned from 879 A.H. According to Firishta he was very strict in the observance of the law of the Prophet. Stewart (p. 101) says he was very strict about the administration of justice, and enjoined on all judges to act with the strictest impartiality.

Sikandar Shāh on the throne of the empire without careful enquiries. <sup>1</sup> As he did not possess the qualifications or the right of being invested with this high office, they removed him from it, and <sup>2</sup> raised Fath Shāh to the chieftainship.

The period of Sikandar Shāh's reign was two <sup>3</sup> and a half days.

#### <sup>4</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF FATH SHĀH.

After the deposition of Sikandar Shāh, the *amīrs* and the great men raised Fath Shāh to the chieftainship and placed him on the throne of the empire. He was intelligent and wise; and placing the usages of ancient rulers and Sultāns in the forefront of his spirit, distributed

word. The other MS. has *امرا و وزرائی بعد از امتحان و تعمق نظر*. The lith. ed. has *امرا و وزرایان تعمق نظر*.

<sup>1</sup> Here again the readings are different. One MS. has *چون استحقاق تقلد* این عمر خطیر نداشت. I have adopted this but have changed عمر, which is manifestly incorrect, for *امر*. The other MS. omits the word *استحقاق* and substitutes *امر* for *عمر*. The lith. ed. omits the word *تقلد*, and has *استحقاق این امر*.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has by mistake *بردارى برداشتند*.

<sup>3</sup> M. Hidayat Hosain has *روز نیم*, half a day, in the text-edition.

<sup>4</sup> Here again the heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text; but the lith. ed. inserts the word *salṭanat* before the name of Fath Shāh.

The *Riyāz* (p. 119) says he was another son of Yūsuf Shāh. Otherwise the *Ṭabaqāt* agrees with it. His full name was Jalāl-ud-dīn Abul Muzaffar Fath Shāh. He is said to have reigned from 887 to 896 A.H., but his coins and inscriptions show that he was already reigning in 886 A.H. Some of the coins of 886 were struck at Fathabad (now Farīdpūr town) which was named after him.

Firishtah says that Fath Shāh punished with the scourge of justice the eunuchs and *Ḥabshī* slaves, who had become powerful and violent. So they went to the chief eunuch called the Sultān Shāhzāda Bangālī, who was in charge of all the men who attended by turns (مردم نوبتی); and also had the keys of all the palaces. It so happened that the eunuch Khān Jahān, the *razār* and Malik Andl *Ḥabshī*, the *Amīr-ud umarā*, were engaged in punishing the Rāys of the frontier, with a picked body of the army; so Sultān Shāhzāda could carry out his nefarious purpose with impunity.

The Cambridge History of India, page 268, contrary to the *Riyāz*, says that Fath Shāh was a great uncle of Sikandar, and a son of Mahmūd which I suppose means Naṣir-ud-dīn Mahmūd Shāh



favours to everyone in accordance with his condition and rank. In his time the doors of pleasure and enjoyment remained open in the faces of the people.

As there was a custom in the country of Bangālah, that five thousand *pāiks* attended every night for watch and ward, and early in the morning, the *bādshāh* came out, and sat on the throne for a moment, and took their salute, and gave them permission to go away, when another body of *pāiks* came into attendance.

On one occasion, the chief eunuch of Fath Shāh tempted the *pāiks* with money and they slew the Sultān. Early the next morning the eunuch himself sat on the throne, and took the salute of the *pāiks*. This event occurred in the year 896 A.H.

The period of the rule of Fath Shāh was seven years and five months.

They say that during some years, there was such a custom in Bangālah, that whoever slew a ruler, and sat on the throne, everyone became submissive and obedient to him.

#### <sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF BĀRBĀK SHĀH.

As the wretched Khwājah Sarāi after murdering his master took the title of *bādshāh*, all the eunuchs, wherever they were, collected

<sup>1</sup> The heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text. The lith. ed. inserts the word *حکومت* before Bārbak Shāh.

The Riyāz (p. 121) agrees generally, but says the eunuch styled himself Sultān Shāhzāda. It goes on to say that he tried to destroy the powerful nobles. The most powerful of them, the Abyssinian Malik Andil, who was at the frontier wanted to come to the capital. Barbag also wanted to bring him there so that he might, by fraud and deceit, put him into prison. He therefore summoned him; and on Malik Andil's coming made him swear on the *Qorān* that he would not injure him in any way. Malik Andil took the oath, with the reservation that he would not do so as long as Bārbak was on the throne. He then schemed to avenge the murder of his benefactor. He got into the palace, and found the eunuch asleep on the throne. On account of his oath he was unable to kill him; but the eunuch who was drunk rolled down. Malik Andil drew his sword, but was unable to kill the eunuch. After this there was a Homeric struggle between the two in the dark. In the end Malik Andil got others to join in the attack and the eunuch was killed.

Malik Andil then summoned the *vazīrs* and a council was held to select a suitable person to succeed to the throne. Fath Shāh had left a son who was

together round him; and he allured mean and low spirited men with wealth. and, <sup>1</sup> strengthening their allegiance with false promises, assembled them round him. His pomp and strength increased day by day; but in the end the great *amīrs* who had many retainers <sup>2</sup> joined together; and on one occasion having united the *pāiks* with themselves, slew him.

The period of his reign was two and a <sup>3</sup> half months.

#### <sup>4</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF FIRŪZ SHĀH.

When the eunuch who had the title of Bārbak Shāh was killed, the *amīrs* and the well-known men raised Firūz Shāh to the chieftain-

only two years of age; and it was doubtful whether he should be placed on the throne. All the nobles then went to the widow of Fath Shāh. She said she had made a vow that the throne should belong to the person who should slay her husband's murderer. Malik Andil at first declined to accept the crown, but was finally persuaded to do so (pp. 122-124).

Firishtah and Stewart and the Cambridge History of India follow the Riyāz generally; but the Cambridge History of India (p. 269), contrary to all the others, calls Malik Andil Indil Khān; I do not know the authority for doing so. He was certainly not a Khān but was a Malik. As to Andil or Indil, I know no Persian or Arabic word like either. There is a colloquial Bengālī word *Andil*, which means much; but I do not know whether it has any connection with the name. In any case I prefer to follow the older historians, instead of accepting the new spelling.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has *منظر* instead of *مستظر* by mistake.

<sup>2</sup> There are differences in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have *اتفاق نموده نوبتی گروہ یابکانرا*. The lith. ed. however has by mistake the word *اتفاق نموده و* after *گروہ*, which I have struck out. The other MS. has *اتفاق نموده و*. *موانقت کرده یابکانرا*. The latter reading appears to be somewhat better, but as the other MS. and the lith. ed. both give the other, I have adopted it, with the slight correction I have mentioned. M. Hidayat Hosain has followed the second MS. in the text-edition.

<sup>3</sup> M. Hidayat Hosain has *دو ماه و نیم روز* or two months and half a day as the period of his reign in the text-edition.

<sup>4</sup> The heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text. The lith. ed. inserts the word *sultānat* before the name Firūz Shāh.

The Tabaqāt does not say that it was Malik Andil who assumed the title of Firūz Shāh.

It appears from the Riyāz (p. 125) that he took up his residence in Gaur, where he erected a mosque, a tower and a reservoir. He had done great deeds

ship. He was a merciful and benevolent king. When the number of the days of his life were folded up (*i.e.*, finished), he passed away by natural death in the year 899 A.H. But another statement is that the *pāik* watchmen killed him.

The period of his rule was three years.

### <sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF MAḤMŪD SHĀH.

When Fīrūz Shāh passed away, the *amīrs* and the great men placed his son on the throne of the empire, giving him the title of Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh. He was a *bādshāh* endowed with the moral qualities of the great.

---

as a general and an administrator; and he was respected and feared when he ascended the throne. He was a just and efficient ruler, but his great fault was his prodigality, and he lavished the treasures accumulated by the former Sultāns on beggars and mendicants. As to his death, the Riyāz (p. 125) says that the statement that he was killed by the *pāiks* appears to be more correct than that he died a natural death. His full name appears from his coins to have been Saifu-d-dīn Abul Muzaffar Fīruz Shāh. His coins show that he reigned from 893 A.H., to 895 A.H., and not during the three years ending in 897 A.H., as stated in the histories (p. 124).

Firishtah and Stewart mention no new facts about him. According to the Cambridge History of India, page 696, he reigned from 891 to 894 A.H.

<sup>1</sup> The heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text. In the lith. ed. it is ذکر محمود شاه بن فیروز شاه.

The full name of Sultān Maḥmūd appears to have been Nāṣir-ud-dīn Abul Muzaffar Maḥmūd Shāh. According to the Riyāz (p. 126) he was only a Sultān in name. During the early months of his brief reign, an Abyssinian of the name of Habsh Khān usurped all the authority. The Sīdī Badr Dīwāna, another Abyssinian, slew Habsh Khān, and became the *de facto* ruler. After some time, he got the *sardārs* of the *pāiks* to join him; and one night slew Maḥmūd Shāh; and with the concurrence of the *amīrs* and the officers of the court, proclaimed himself Sultān under the title of Muzaffar Shāh.

The Riyāz (p. 126) also says, that according to the history of Hājī Muḥammad Qandahari, Maḥmūd Shāh was the son of Fath Shāh, and not of Malik Andīl or Fīrūz Shāh. He had been brought up by Jashn Khān, a slave of Būrbag Shāh, under the orders of Fīruz Shāh; and after the latter's death was placed on the throne. The name Jashn Khān appears to be a copyist's mistake for Habsh Khān.

Firishtah agrees generally with the Riyāz. He gives the name of the slave who brought Sultān Maḥmūd up as Habsh Khān and not Jashn Khān.

A slave of the name of Saiyidi Muẓaffar Ḥabshī having got the *sardārs* and the *paiks* to combine with him, made Maḥmūd Shāh a martyr one night; and early the next morning ascended the throne of the empire, giving himself the title of Muẓaffar Shāh.

The period of the reign of Maḥmūd Shāh was one year.

### <sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF MUẒAFFAR SHĀH ḤABSHI.

When Muẓaffar Shāh Ḥabshī took the place of the great by force and violence, darkness spread over the world. He was an audacious

<sup>1</sup> I have adopted the reading in the lith. ed. Those in the MSS. are very imperfect. One has only Muẓaffar Shāh, and the other has ذکرمظفر حبشی. His name according to his inscriptions and coins was Alau-d-din Abul Muẓaffar Shāh (Salam's translation of Riṣṣ, p. 128, note 2). From his coins it appears that he reigned from 896 to 899 A.H., i.e., from 1491 to 1494 A.D.

According to the Riṣṣ (p. 127) Muẓaffar ascended the throne at Gaur. He was extremely audacious and blood-thirsty; and put many learned and pious men and nobles and the Rajahs to death. He appointed Syed Husain a Sharif of Mecca (who is called one of Muẓaffar's *sipāhis* in the Ṭabaqāt) to be his minister, and made over to him all powers. Afterwards he added avarice to his other iniquities; and according to the advice of Syed Husain, he reduced the wages of his cavalry and infantry men; and also collected the revenue with great harshness. Then the great *amīrs* rebelled against him; and he shut himself up in the fort of Gaur. The siege lasted for four months; and Muẓaffar is said to have slain four thousand men, who had been seized and brought to him from time to time with his own hand. Then he came out of the fort, and a drawn battle took place between his men and the *amīrs* now headed by Syed Husain. The latter were victorious and Muẓaffar was slain. It is also stated, that according to Hajī Muḥammad Qandahari, one hundred and twenty thousand men, Musalmān and Hindus were slain during this civil war. The Riṣṣ (p. 128) then quotes from Ṭabaqāt, what is stated in the latter about the manner in which Muẓaffar was slain.

Firishtah and Stewart give no further information. The Cambridge History of India, page 270, calls the minister, who according to the Riṣṣ was called Syed Husain, Sharif Makī, Saiyid 'Alā-ud-din Husain, who belonged to a family which came from Turmūz on the Oxus; and it also states that this man probably restrained Muẓaffar's violence, while according to the Riṣṣ and Firishtah the reduction in the pay of the soldiers, which was one of the causes of the rebellion, took place at his instance. It appears from what is stated in the account of the reign of Sultān 'Alau-d-din, in the Riṣṣ that the name of Sultān 'Alau-d-din before his accession was Syed Husain Sharif Makki, that his father Syed Ashraf-ud-Din was probably Sherif of Mecca, but the family

and blood-thirsty man. He raised many learned and pious men to the rank of martyrdom. In the end one of his soldiers, of the name of 'Alā-ud-dīn, having made the *sardārs* and the *poīs* friendly and in league with him, entered the seraglio one night with thirteen *poīs*, and slew him. Early the next morning, he sat on the throne and gave himself the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn.

The period of the reign of Muẓaffar Shāh Ḥabshī was three years and five months.

### <sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN.

Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn <sup>2</sup> was an intelligent and able man and was a soldier. He showed favour to the *amīrs* of old lineage; and he also

---

came from Tarmūz or Tarmāj in Tukestān. Sayyid Ḥussain and his brother Sayyid Yūsuf came with their father to Bengal; and settled in Chandpur in Raḡha, of western Bengal. According to Blochmann, however, this Chāndpur was really situated near 'Alāipūr in the present district of Khulna. It appears also that although Sayyid Ḥussain adopted the title of 'Alāuddīn Abul Muẓaffar Ḥussain Shāh, he was universally known as Ḥussain Shāh; and that name is found on various inscriptions on the edifices in Gaūr; and according to Blochmann (*J.A.S.B.* for 1873, page 291) "the name of 'Ḥussain Shāh the good' is still remembered from the frontiers of Orissa to the Brahmaputra". The statement in the Cambridge History of India (p. 270) about the original name of 'Alā-ud-dīn Ḥussain Shāh being Sayyid 'Alā-ud-dīn Ḥussain appears to be incorrect.

<sup>1</sup> The heading in one MS. and the lith. ed. is ذکّر سلطان علا الدین; in the other it is only سلطان علا الدین; I have retained the former.

<sup>2</sup> The lith. ed. has the word چون before Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn; but as both MSS. omit it, I have also omitted it. The account of his reign in the *Ṭabaqāt* is very imperfect. According to the *Riyāz* (pp. 129-136), although he became a good and great Sultān, his conduct does not appear to have been quite straightforward before his accession. Although he was in the service of Sultān Muẓaffar he always spoke to everyone of the latter's meanness and avarice. In this way his own virtues and the vices of his master became known to everybody: so when Muẓaffar was killed, the chiefs and the people readily consented to his becoming his successor. Then the way in which he rewarded the people, who raised him to the throne, was extremely objectionable. He allowed them to plunder and ravage the city of Gaūr. Some days after his accession, he ordered the men to cease plundering, and when they did not do so, he had twelve thousand of them put to death. As a result of searching the houses of the wealthy he collected much wealth including thirteen hundred golden dishes.

raised his own special servants to high ranks and eminent positions. He removed the *paiks* from the duty of watch and ward, so that no injury might be caused to him by them. He summoned learned, great and pious men from different parts of the kingdom, and showed kindness to them. He made very great efforts and exertions for enriching and improving the condition of the country; and he allotted many villages for defraying the expenses of the ahns houses, attached to the tomb of that leader of the wayfarers (in the path of the law), Shaikh Nūr Qūth 'Ālam, may his soul be sanctified! He came every year from Ekdāla, which was the seat of his government to Pandūah, with the object of circumambulating the tomb, which was the recipient of illumination, of Shaikh Nūr.

Owing to the auspiciousness of his landable morals, and pleasing virtues he performed the duties of sovereignty for long years; and all his life was passed in pleasure and enjoyment. And in the end in the year 929 A.H. he passed away by death from natural causes. The period of his reign was twenty-seven years and some months.

His evil deeds ceased after this. He removed the *paiks* from the work of watch and ward; and dismissed all the Habshis; and he employed Syeds, Mughals and Afghans in position of trust. He subjugated the Rajas of the country, and having conquered as far as Orissa levied tribute from the rulers of that country. He then invaded Assam; and conquered that country as far as Kāmrup and Kāmtah (Kāmaksha (?)). He left his son there with a large army, and returned to Bengal. Afterwards when the rains commenced, the Rajas, who had fled to the mountains, returned; and his army was defeated, and his son was slain.

The Riyāz then mentions his charities and his religious endowments.

In the year 900 A.H., Sultān Husain Sharqi on being defeated by Sikandar Lodi took refuge in Kahlgaon (Colgong), where he was received with honour and where he passed his remaining years.

Sultān 'Alau-d-din died of natural causes in 927 A.H. The period of his reign was, according to different authorities, twenty-seven years, twenty-four years and twenty-nine years and five months. He had fourteen sons and one of them, Nuṣrat Shāh, succeeded him.

Firishṭah does not mention any fresh fact. Stewart (p. 110) says that Ala Addeen Hussein Shah came from the sandy deserts of Arabia to the fertile region of Bengal.

The Cambridge History of India also adds nothing to what is stated in the Riyāz. According to it his reign lasted for twenty-five years (p. 272). The words *و سپاهی* and a soldier, are omitted in the text-edition.

<sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF NAṢĪB SHĀH.

When Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn passed away, the *amīrs* and the great men of the time raised <sup>2</sup> Naṣīb Shāh from amongst his eighteen sons to the chieftainship (i.e., to be the Sultān). <sup>3</sup> He, trusting his brothers, conferred on each one of them, double of what their father had bestowed on them.

And when, in the year 932 A.H., His Majesty Firdūs Makānī Zahīr-ud-dīn Muḥammad Bābar *Bādshāh*, having slain Sultān Ibrāhīm Lūdī, son of Sultān Sikandar Lūdī, took possession of the country of Dehli, the *amīrs* and the heads of <sup>4</sup> the various groups of Afghāns fled and came as suppliants to <sup>5</sup> Naṣīb Shāh. After some days, Sultān Maḥmūd, brother of Sultān Ibrāhīm also came to him, <sup>6</sup> as a suppliant. Naṣīb-Shāh bestowed on all of them *jāgīrs*, as far as possible and depending on the exigencies of the time. <sup>7</sup> He also prayed for the hand of the daughter of Sultān Ibrāhīm for himself.

In <sup>8</sup> the year 939 A.H. he sent by the hand of the eunuch Malīk Marjān to Sultān Bahādur Gujrātī, fine and beautiful presents, in

<sup>1</sup> The heading is as I have it in the text in both the MSS. The lith. ed. has ذکر سلطنت نصیب شاه, an account of the reign of Naṣīb Shāh. Both headings are incorrect. It appears that the correct name of the eldest son of 'Alā-ud-dīn Ḥusain Shah was Naṣīb Khān; and he assumed the title of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn Abul Muẓaffar Naṣrat Shāh. The *Riyāz*, however, says that his name or title was Naṣrat Shāh; and he was commonly known as Naṣīb Shāh.

<sup>2</sup> The name is Nāṣir Shāh in one MS. and in the lith. ed. and Naṣīb Shāh in the other MS. I have adopted Naṣīb Shāh.

<sup>3</sup> This was quite unusual for the age. The *Riyāz* (text, p. 136) says پسندیده ترین کاری که ازو بظهور آمده این بود که برادران را بحبس و قید نداده - مناسب هر یکی را از آنچه پدر عنایت فرموده بود - دوچند ساخت. Other historians have also mentioned this generous action.

<sup>4</sup> The readings in the MSS. are و سران گرو - و افغان and و سران گرو افغان. The lith. ed. has و سران گرو افغانان, which appears to me to be better than the other readings, and I have retained it.

<sup>5</sup> Here both the MSS. have نصیب شاه Naṣīb Shāh.

<sup>6</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have باو ملتجی شد, but the other MS. has باو ملحق.

<sup>7</sup> As was usual under the circumstances he married her.

<sup>8</sup> The reason of this embassy to Sultān Bahādur Shāh of Gujrāt which was sent in 939 A.H., is said in the *Riyāz* (pp. 137, 138) to have been a report that Humāyūn after his accession intended to conquer Bengal.

order to secure relation, attachment and friendship. Malik Marjān waited on Sultān Bahādur in the fort of Mandū and was honoured by the gift of a special robe of honour. No account of the Bengālis has after this come under my eyes. Naṣīb Shāh ruled for a period of eleven years. After him, Bangālāh came within a short time into the possession of Shēr Khān. When His Majesty Jinnat Ashiānī came into Bangālāh, in pursuit of Shēr Khān, Jahāngīr Qulī Bēg ruled (the country) on behalf of him. Afterwards Shēr Khān slew Jahāngīr Qulī Bēg, and took possession of the country, as has been mentioned in its place. Then Muḥammad Khān, one of the *amīrs* of Salīm Khān, son of Shēr Khān, governed the country for a time. After him, his son gave himself the title of Sultān Bahādur, and raised the standard of rule. The government of Bangālāh and Behūr was then held by Sulaimān Katarānī, one of the *amīrs* of Salīm Khān. He ruled independently for a period of nine years, and also took possession of the

<sup>1</sup> Nizām-ud-dīn gives no account of the death of Naṣīb Shāh. It appears from the Riyāz and other histories, that contrary to the mildness which he had shown in the beginning of his reign, he now indulged in evil deeds, and committed acts of oppression to the eunuchs, one of whom he had threatened with punishment, combined together and killed him in the year 943 A.H. The period of his reign is variously given. The Riyāz (p. 138) says that he reigned for sixteen years, but according to some thirteen years, or less than that. Firḥtāh gives him sixteen years from 927 to 943 A.H. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 350-352) says he reigned from 930 A.H., 1523 A.D., to 945 A.H., 1538 A.D. i.e., for about fifteen years; but he says also that he had a reign of eighteen years. According to Stewart (pp. 114-117) he reigned for thirteen years 1521 A.D. to 1533-34 A.D. Lane-Poole (p. 308) gives him fourteen years from 925 A.H., 1518 A.D., to 939 A.H., 1532 A.D., and the Cambridge History of India (p. 696) fifteen years from 1518 to 1533 A.D.

<sup>2</sup> There are differences, as to the period of Sulaimān Katarānī's rule. One MS. has seven years; the other has the word *sāl*, year without any number. The lith. ed. has one year. There is much diversity also in the other histories as to the period of his rule. The Riyāz (p. 153) says he ruled independently for sixteen years, and died in 981 A.H. Firḥtāh says he had the *Khufā* read in his own name, but called himself *Huḍrat Ā'alū*, and sent presents to Akbar from time to time; and after reigning for about twenty-five years died in 981 A.H. Stewart (pp. 149, 150) says he reigned from 972 when he came from Behar to Bengal till his death in 981 A.H., affecting to hold his kingdom under Akbar. In the Cambridge History of India, the name of Sulaimān does not appear in the Index at all but in the list of the Kings of Bengal on page 696, he is shown as having reigned in 980 A.H. for some months only.



country of Orissa. Although he had not had the *Khaṭba* read in his own name, still he assumed the title of *Ḥaḍrat Ālā*. When he died, his son <sup>1</sup> succeeded him; but his rule did not extend beyond thirteen days. He was killed by the efforts (machinations) of his own relations. The government was then allotted to his brother Dāūd. He made dying struggles for a period of two years, till he was defeated in the year 982 A.H. by Khān Khānān, who was the commander-in-chief of the army of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Jalāhī; and the country of Bangālāh was conquered. Afterwards in the year 984 A.H., he was slain by Khān Jahān, who after Khān Khānān had been honoured with the government of Bangālāh, as has been narrated in its own place. And up to this day, which is the year 1002 *Hijrī*, the country of Bangālāh and Ekdāla are in the possession of the servants of the powerful empire.

## SECTION VII. THE SECTION ABOUT THE SHARQĪ SULTĀNS.

The Sharqī Sultāns <sup>2</sup> ruled in the country of Jaumpūr and the neighbouring tracts from <sup>3</sup> the beginning of the year 784 A.H. to

<sup>1</sup> His name is Bāyazīd.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have *کردند*, but the other MS. has *کردند اند*.

<sup>3</sup> The lith. ed. is very incorrect. The MSS. agree; but whereas the total

the year 881 A.H., which was a period of ninety-seven years. (The rulers were):—

Sultān-ush-sharq, *Khwājah Jahān*, sixteen years;

Mubārak Shāh Sharqī, one year and some months;

Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqī, forty years and some months;

Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Ibrāhīm, twenty-one years and some months;

Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Sultān Maḥmūd, five years;

Sultān Husain, son of Maḥmūd, nineteen years;

### <sup>1</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN-USH-SHARQ.

It is traditionally recorded that when the turn of the reign of Sultān Maḥmūd, son of Sultān <sup>2</sup> Muḥammad, son of Firūz Shāh came, he sent the eunuch, Malik Sarwar, on whom Sultān Muḥammad Shāh had conferred the title of *Khwājah Jahān* to the country of Jaunpūr, after bestowing on him the title of Sultān-ush-sharq; and conferred the government of that country on him. When Sultān Maḥmūd lost his (power and) grandeur, Sultān-ush-sharq became completely independent; and having punished the insurgents of *parganas Kōl* and *Itāwah*, <sup>3</sup> *Kānpilah* and *Bahrāich*, brought all the territory from the

---

1 year according to the Cambridge History of India. No. 6 has 19 years according to the *Ṭabaqāt*, but 18 years according to Lane-Poole from 863 to 881 A.H., when he fled to Bengal, and 22 A.H. years or 21 A.D. years according to the Cambridge History of India. It appears to me that it is impossible to have a correct list of the periods of the different reigns.

<sup>1</sup> The heading in the MS. is as I have it in the text. In the lith. ed. the word *سلطنت* is inserted before *سلطان الشرق*.

Firishtah says that the Sultān-ush-sharq was sent to Jaunpūr and Behār and Tihūt in Jamādī-ul-āwwal 726 A.H., and he died in 802 A.H.; and the period of his rule was six years. According to Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 359) he was sent in 796 A.H., which reconciles the discrepancy. The dates in Col. Briggs's history agree with those given by Lane-Poole and the Cambridge History of India.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. has Muḥammad which is correct. The other omits the words, "son of Sultān Muḥammad", while the lith. ed. has Maḥmūd instead of Muḥammad.

<sup>3</sup> Written as *کنیلہ*, and *کندیلہ* in the MSS., and *کپیلہ* in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has *Kōl*, *Itāwah*, *Bharāich* and *Kānpilah*, (*کنپیلہ*) all in the *Doāb*.

direction of Dehli, as far as *parganas* Kōl and Rāpri, and in the other direction as far as Behār and Tīrhūt under his government. The country again attained a new grandeur. He again obtained elephants and other tributes which used to come every year from the country of Lakhnauti, but which had not come for some years owing to the weakness of the rulers (of Dehli). His greatness and grandeur made such an impression on the minds of the *zamīndārs* (Hindu chieftains), that they without any demand used every year to send the tribute that had been fixed.

In the year 802 A.H., the marauding <sup>1</sup> Turk of death robbed the capital of the life of the Sultān-ush-sharq.

The period of his rule was sixteen years.

## 2 AN ACCOUNT OF MUBĀRAK SHĀH SHARQI.

When Sultān-ush-sharq died, and about the time when the affairs of the government of Dehli became more and more disordered; and the administration became disorganised, Malik Mubārak Qarnful, who was the adopted son of Sultān-ush-sharq, in concert with the *amīrs* and *sardārs* gave himself the title of Mubārak Shāh, and raised the standard of government. The *Khutba* was read in his name in the country of Jaunpūr and in the other countries, which had been in the possession of Sultān-ush-sharq.

When the news that Sultān-ush-sharq had died, and Malik Mubārak Qarnful had assumed the title of Mubārak Shāh, reached Mallū Iqbāl Khān, he in the year <sup>3</sup> 803 A.H., collected a large army; and advanced towards Jaunpūr. On the way, he chastised the insur-

<sup>1</sup> One MS. omits the word ترک.

<sup>2</sup> The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS. The lith. ed. inserts the word مبارک شاه شرقی before سلطنت.

<sup>3</sup> The year is ثمانه و ثلاث, 803 A.H. in one MS. In the other it is 803-4, which is absurd in meaning. The lith. ed. has 804 A.H. The reading in the first MS. is correct. Firishtah has that year; further, the year 804 A.H. was crowded with too many events. An account of these events has been given on pages 283, 284 of vol. I of the translation of this work. Neither Firishtah nor the Cambridge History of India gives any additional facts.

gents of Itāwah and arrived at Kanauj. Mubārak Shāh also <sup>1</sup> collected an army, and came forward to oppose him. As the river Ganges flowed between the two armies, they remained camped opposite each other for two months, and neither had the courage and boldness to place their foot on the field of bravery, and to cross the river. They retired each to their own country without risking a battle. After Mubārak Shāh had arrived at Jampūr, news reached him that Sultān Maḥmūd had returned to Dehlī from Gujrat; and Mallū Iqbāl Khān was again advancing towards Kanauj, taking Sultān Maḥmūd with him. Immediately on hearing this news, he began to collect his army; but death did not give him time; and in the year 804 A.H., he accepted the summons of the just God.

The period of his rule was one year and some months.

#### AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN IBRĀHĪM SHARQI.

After the death of Mubārak Shāh, the *amīrs* of the Sharqī dominions placed his younger brother, to whom they gave the title of Sultān Ibrāhīm, on the <sup>2</sup> seat of the government, and the throne of the empire. All classes of men had rest in his time in the cradle of peace and safety. The <sup>3</sup> learned and the great, who were in distress of mind from the disturbances in the world, turned their faces to Jaunpūr which became at that time the seat of peace; and that metropolis (that is, Jaunpūr) became, from the splendour of their advent, the city of learning. Some books and treatises, such as the <sup>4</sup> “*Hāshīyah*’-

<sup>1</sup> The words are جمعیت نمودہ in one MS. and in the lith. ed.; and incorrectly حمیت نمودہ in the other MS.

<sup>2</sup> One MS. and the lith. ed. have اورنگ حکومت; the other MS. has ارباب حکومت; I have followed the reading in the first manuscript.

<sup>3</sup> *Firishtah* amplifies and explains this by saying فضلاء ممالک ہندوستان و دانشمندان ایران و توران i.e., the learned men of the country of India, and the wise men of Persia and Turkistan.

<sup>4</sup> *Firishtah* gives some account of these books. They appear to have been all written by Qādī Shihāb-ud-dīn Jaunpūrī, whose native place was Ghaznīn, and who had received his education in Daulatābād in the Deccan. *Firishtah* says that Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqī held him with such honour that once when he was seriously ill, the Sultān went to make enquiries, and after making them fill a cup with water, and passing it round the head of the sick man, drank

i-Hindī", "the<sup>1</sup> Baḥr-ul-Mawāj", the "Fatāwī-i-Ibrāhīm Shāhī", the "Irshād" and others (were written in his name). As divine help was always attendant on that world-protecting *bādshāh*, he had necessarily in the beginning of his reign carried off the prize in the<sup>2</sup> field of spirituality from all the sovereigns of *Hindūstān*, in the matter of experience and knowledge of affairs.

In the beginning of his reign he collected an army, and advanced to destroy Sultān Maḥmūd and Mallū Iqbāl Khān, who had the thought of conquering Jaunpūr in their heads. When the two armies encamped in front of each other, Sultān Maḥmūd, on the ground that Mallū Iqbāl Khān did not permit him to interfere at all in the affairs of the empire, and did not place before him, for his decision, the facts and circumstances of any administrative problems, went out from his own camp on the pretext of going out to hunt, and joined Sultān Ibrāhīm. <sup>3</sup>The latter owing to haughtiness and pride did not perform the duty which he owed to his salt, and delayed and procrastinated in making enquiries (about his health, etc.). Sultān Maḥmūd feeling aggrieved betook himself to Kanauij; and removing the *thānadār* of the place, who had been there from before the time of Mubārak Shāh, and who was called <sup>4</sup>Amirzādah'-i-Harvī (*Amīr-zāda* of Harāt) took possession

---

it off, praying to God, that every danger that might happen to him may ward off him, and should fall on himself. This was like Bābar's offering himself for the recovery of Humāyūn, but it was more beautiful, being quite disinterested. The Qādī also loved the Sultān so dearly that he died the same year as the Sultān, though according to another account, he died two years later.

<sup>1</sup> One of the MSS. omits 15 or 16 lines from after the word بحر المواج to the words امرأ را رخصت جاگیر نمود. They are, however, written further on.

<sup>2</sup> The words actually used are مضار معالي. I cannot find any meaning of مضار which would suit the context.

<sup>3</sup> Firishtah explains, that Sultān Maḥmūd had expected that Sultān Ibrāhīm keeping before his eyes the rights and dues of hereditary salt and service, will either raise him to sovereignty, or giving him help, crush Iqbāl Khān; but as Ibrāhīm Sharqī had tasted the joys of sovereignty, and his rule had not yet become quite firm, neither of Sultān Maḥmūd's hopes were realised. For another version of these incidents, see page 284 of vol. I of the translation.

<sup>4</sup> The word appears to be میرزاده هروی in the MSS. The lith ed. has امیرزاده هروی. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has امیرزاده هروی. I have adopted this.

of the place. On hearing this news, Sultān Ibrāhīm and Mallū, Iqbāl Khān went respectively to Jampur and Dehli, leaving Kanauj to Sultān Maḥmūd. It has, however, come to my notice in some histories, that Sultān Maḥmūd actually went to Mubārak Shāh Sharqī; at this time the latter died, and Sultān Ibrāhīm succeeded him. God only knows the truth!

In the year 807 A.H., Mallū Iqbāl Khān again came to besiege Kanauj. Sultān Maḥmūd with a small number of his special retainers fortified himself, and behaved with bravery. Mallū returned to Dehli disappointed and unsuccessful. And when in the following year he was slain by Khidr Khān in the neighbourhood of Ajōdahān, as has been already mentioned, Sultān Maḥmūd came to Dehli, leaving <sup>1</sup> Malik Maḥmūd at Kanauj, and sat on the throne of his great ancestors. Sultān Ibrāhīm availing himself of this great opportunity, determined to conquer Kanauj in the year 809 A.H. Sultān Maḥmūd marched with the army of Dehli, in order to engage him. The two armies encamped facing each other on the banks of the Ganges; and after a few days went back without fighting to their own territories. When Sultān Maḥmūd arrived in Dehli, and gave permission to the *amīrs* to go back to their own *jāgīrs*, Sultān Ibrāhīm came back again, and laid siege to Kanauj. After the period of the siege had been protracted to four months, and no help or reinforcements arrived from Dehli, Malik Maḥmūd prayed for quarter, and surrendered Kanauj. Sultān Ibrāhīm made over Kanauj to Ikhtiyār Khān, and advanced to conquer Dehli. On the way Tātār Khān, son of Sārang Khān, and Malik <sup>2</sup> Marjūn slave of Mallū Iqbāl Khān came from Dehli, and joined him. Sultān Ibrāhīm gaining greater power and strength marched towards Sanbal; and when he arrived there, Asad Khān Lāndī abandoned the place and fled. Sultān Ibrāhīm entrusted Sanbal

<sup>1</sup> Called Malik Maḥmūd Turnati on page 287 of vol. I of the translation. He is also called *ترمنی* in Firishta's account of Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqī. It also appears from that account that Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqī passed the rainy season at Kanauj; and advanced towards Dehli in the month of Jamādi-ul-āwwal, 810 A.H.

<sup>2</sup> Called Malik Marhabā on page 288 of vol. I of the translation.

to <sup>1</sup>Tātār Khān, and continued his march towards Dehli. On the way he seized the town of Baran, and made it over to Malik Marjān.

When he arrived on the bank of the <sup>2</sup>Jamunā, his scouts brought the news, that Sultān Muzaḥḥar Gujrātī had arrived in Mālwa, and was coming to aid and reinforce Sultān Maḥmūd. Sultān Ibrāhīm surrendering the reins of bravery returned towards Jaunpūr. Sultān Maḥmūd made over the government of Sanbal, in accordance with the ancient custom to Asad Khān Lūdī, and returned to Dehli.

In the <sup>3</sup>year 831 A.H., Sultān Ibrāhīm advanced to attack the fort of Biānah. At this time Khidr Khān ruled in Dehli. He advanced from there to meet and destroy Sultān Ibrāhīm. After the two armies had met, the battle raged from morning to evening; and much slaughter and bloodshed occurred. On the following day a <sup>4</sup>peace was concluded, and Sultān Ibrāhīm returned to Jaunpūr and Khidr Khān to Dehli.

In the year 837 A.H., Sultān Ibrāhīm was able to repair the damages and losses sustained by his army; and having set his mind at rest in respect of the insurgents in the various parts of his dominions, he determined to conquer Kālpi; and advanced with full force.

---

At this time news came that Sultān Hūshang Ghūrī had also determined upon the conquest of Kālpī. When the two *bādshāhs* arrived near each other, and a battle became a matter of today or tomorrow, the scouts brought the news, that Mubārak Shāh, son of Khidr Khān, had collected an immense army, and intended to march from Dehli for the conquest of Jaunpūr. Sultān Ibrāhīm having lost all control of himself retired towards Jaunpūr. Sultān Hūshang took possession of Kālpī, without any dispute, and having had the *Khutba* read in his own name returned to Mandū.

In the year 840 A.H. a disease attacked Sultān Ibrāhīm's person. Although physicians treated him, no improvement resulted; and in the end he accepted the summons of God.

The period of his rule was <sup>1</sup> forty years and some months and some days.

## <sup>2</sup> AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN MAHMŪD, SON OF IBRĀHīm SHARQI.

When Sultān Ibrāhīm surrendered the deposit of life, his eldest son Sultān Mahmūd sat on the throne of Jaunpūr and became the successor of his father. The gardens of the hopes of the people became refreshed and verdant with the abundance of the rain of his benefaction. The kingdom acquired a new grandeur and greatness; and the people received happiness and joy. After regulating the affairs of the army and the kingdom and the punishment of the insurgents and the turbulent people, he sent in the year 847 A.H., an eloquent ambassador with beautiful gifts and presents to Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī, and with the message <sup>3</sup> that "Naṣir Khān Jahān, son of Qādir

<sup>1</sup> The readings are slightly different. One MS. has the reading I have adopted in the text. The other has چهل سال و چند ماه بود, without any verb, while the lith. ed. has چهل سال و چند روز بود; this has been adopted by M. Hidayat Hosain in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS. In the lith. ed. the word *saltanat* is inserted before and the word Sharqī after the word Sultān Mahmūd.

<sup>3</sup> He is so called in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah, however, omits the word *Jahān*. The Cambridge History of India (p. 252) says that Naṣir and before him his father Qādir had taken advantage of the disputes regarding the succession to the throne of Mīlwa to declare their independence,



Khān, the ruler of Kālpī, had placed his foot outside the path of the law of the Prophet, and was following the path of heterodoxy, that he had destroyed the town of Shāhpūr, which was larger and more populous than Kālpī, had banished Musalmāns from their homes, and had made over Musalmān women to *Kāfirs*, and as from the time of Sultān Hūshang, of blessed memory, to the present day, the chain of attachment and the relations of affection had become strengthened between the two parties, it appeared obligatory on me under the behest of the *Qāḍī 'Aqal* (Reason), that I should reveal it to your justice-loving mind. If you permit it, I shall chastise him, and make the tenets and rites of the Muhammadan religion current in that country”.

Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji wrote in reply, “These matters had come to my hearing in the shape of false rumours; but that now your honourable self, the leader of Sultāns, has notified them to me, they have reached the standard of definite knowledge; and under these circumstances, <sup>1</sup> the destruction of that wicked person is incumbent on all *bādshāhs*. If my own forces were not engaged in chastising the rebels of Mēwāt, I would myself <sup>2</sup> have advanced to destroy him. Now that that asylum of *salṭanats* has formed this resolution, may it be of good omen!”

The ambassador came back to Jaunpūr, and narrated what had happened. Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī was pleased in his mind; and sent twenty-nine elephants to Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji, as a present.

and to assume the title of Naṣīr Shāh and Qāḍī Shāh. Naṣīr Shāh appears to have adopted some heretical practices; but I think the Cambridge History of India is wrong in assuming that Sultān Maḥmūd was entirely actuated by religious motives in his proceedings against him. It should be remembered that Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqī had attempted unsuccessfully to seize Kālpī, which had, however, been taken by Sultān Hūshang of Mālwa. Indeed a few lines later on, the Cambridge History of India (page 253) expresses a doubt as to whether Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī was impelled by ambition or by a just appreciation of the offences of which Naṣīr had been guilty.

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has by mistake دفع اول خاطر جميع بادشاهان instead of ان دفع ان. فاجر بر جميع بادشاهان.

<sup>2</sup> There are slight variations in the readings. The MSS. have عازم میگردد and عازم میگردد; while the lith. ed. has عازم میگردند. I prefer عازم میگردد.

He then collected his troops, and advanced towards Kālpī. Naṣir K̲h̲ān, becoming acquainted with this, submitted a report to Sultān Maḥmūd K̲h̲ālji to the following purport: "Sultān Hūshang Shāh of blessed memory bestowed this country on me. Now Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī wishes to take possession of it with force and violence; and the defence of this *fuqīr* is obligatory on the (noble) spirit of the Sultān."

Sultān Maḥmūd K̲h̲ālji, on becoming acquainted with the purport of this petition, wrote a letter couched in terms of sincerity and affection, and sent 'Alī K̲h̲ān with it and with suitable presents to the Sharqī Sultān; and mentioned in it that "Naṣir K̲h̲ān, the ruler of Kālpī having the fear of God and that Lord of grandeur before his eyes, has become repentant; and has promised, that, having redressed and corrected what had happened, he would not again place his foot outside the path of the law of the Prophet; <sup>1</sup> and in carrying out the behests of providence (*Aḥkām Samāwī*) would permit no hesitation or dilatoriness. As Sultān Hūshang, who has received the mercy of God, had bestowed that country on Qādir K̲h̲ān, his successors are enlisted in the band of those who are faithful and obedient to me. We should, therefore, pardoning his former transgressions, forbear from further interference with his territory."

The reply to the letter and petition of 'Alī K̲h̲ān (*i.e.*, I suppose the letter of Sultān Maḥmūd K̲h̲ālji sent by the hand of 'Alī K̲h̲ān) had not yet arrived, when another petition of Naṣir K̲h̲ān came, to the effect that, "This *fuqīr* has borne the ring of sincere loyalty in his ear, and the burden of obedience on his shoulder (these were ancient marks of slavery) since the time of Sultān Hūshang; and now Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī has, on account of an old grudge and ancient enmity, invaded Kālpī, and seizing the country with pomp and power, has turned the *fuqīr* out of his native territory and has imprisoned Musalmān women". And in spite of the fact that Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī had obtained permission to chastise Naṣir K̲h̲ān, still when the latter had made humble and pitiful supplications, (Sultān Maḥmūd

---

<sup>1</sup> The word is different in the MS. and in the lith. ed. One MS. has تقلد, the other has what looks like تقلد. The lith. ed. has القاء. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has نفاذ.

Khalji) advanced on the 2nd Sha'bān of the year 840 A.H. towards Chandēri and Kālpi. At Chandēri Naṣir Khān came and <sup>1</sup>waited on him. From Chandēri, the Sultān advanced towards <sup>2</sup>Erij. Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī, hearing this news, immediately started for Kālpi to meet him. Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji sent a detachment to oppose the Jaunpūr army, and another detachment to plunder the rear-guard of that army. The latter went and slew the men, who had been left behind in the camp; and looted whatever they could lay their hands upon. The detachment, that had been sent to confront the Jaunpūr army, stretched its hands in conflict and battle; and brave and useful men were killed on both sides. In the end, the two armies retired to their respective camps. On the following morning, Sultān Maḥmūd sent 'Imād-ul-mulk to block the enemy's road. The latter becoming aware of this intention remained where they were, which was a strong and rugged and difficult position.

Sultān Maḥmūd, becoming aware of the strength of the ground sent a detachment to plunder the environs of Kālpi, and it returned after taking much booty. When the rainy season came, a sort of peace was patched up; and the parties retraced their steps. Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji came to Chandēri; and Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī, taking advantage of the opportunity, sent troops to raid the country of Barhār, the residents of which were obedient to Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji. The latter sent a detachment, to help and reinforce the headman of the country of Barhār. As the detachment, which had been sent by Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī, was not sufficiently strong to meet it, the latter himself came and joined it.

After a few days, Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī sent a letter to the Shaikh-ul-Islām, Shaikh Jā'aldah, who was one of the great and holy men of the age, and towards whom Sultān Maḥmūd Khalji had right relations of reverence and faith, and whose remains are now buried under the dome of the tomb of the Sultāns of Mālwa at Mandū, to the following purport, viz., "Musalmāns on both sides have been slain,

<sup>1</sup> Both MSS. have بملاقات; but the lith. ed. has بملازمة, which appears to me to be more appropriate, and I have retained it. M. Hidayat Ḥosain has retained بملاقات in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> M. Hidayat Ḥosain has ابرجة in the text-edition.

<sup>1</sup> and it would be well if (your Holiness) would endeavour to effect concord and friendship (between the contending powers)". The emissary of Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī made this statement to Shaikh Jā'īdah, that his master would at once make over the town of Rātah to Naṣīr Khān; and within four months after the return of Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī, he would also make over to Naṣīr Khān the <sup>2</sup> town of <sup>3</sup> Erij, and the whole of the country of Kālpi, which had come into his possession.

When Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī's emissary submitted this proposal to Shaikh Jā'īdah, the latter sent him in the company of his own *Khādim*, (servant or disciple), to Sultān Maḥmūd (Khaljī); and also sent a letter containing much advice. Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī decided, that no peace could take place unless Kālpi was immediately handed over. But Naṣīr Khān, who had been driven out of his territory considered that the recovery of Rātah would be a great boon; and submitted that as Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī was making the promise in the presence of noble men and before Shaikh Jā'īdah, it was certain that there would be no deviation from it. When Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī saw, that the man most interested in the matter was satisfied with this settlement, he sent for Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī's emissary into his presence and accepted his proposals, on the condition that after that date Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī would not in any way interfere

<sup>1</sup> There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. has اگر صلاح ذات البین توجه فرمایند - بهتر باشد. The other has اگر در صلاح ذات البین سعی, after which some words are evidently left out. The lith. ed. has اگر صلاح ذات البین سعی فرمایند - بهتر باشد. Firishlah in the corresponding passage has اگر در صلاح ذات البین سعی رود. The meaning is not quite clear, but I think the translation conveys the intended idea.

<sup>2</sup> There are differences in readings here also. One MS. has قصبه ایرج و سائر بلاد کالپی. This appears to be correct and I have adopted it. The other MSS. have قصبه ایرج و چرمور و اسید و کالپی. The lith. ed. has قصبه ایرج و چرمور و کالپی. The corresponding line in the lith. ed. of Firishlah appears to be different and incorrect. It is بالفعل قصبه ایرجه و کالپی که به تصرف سلطان شرقی درآمده انرا نیز به نصیر خان خواهد گذاشت.

<sup>3</sup> The name is transliterated as Irij in the Cambridge History of India (p. 253), but later on (pp. 355 and 364), it is printed as Erij.

with the descendants of Qādir Shāh, and more specially with Naṣīr Khān Jahān; and for the last time the footsteps of his soldiers should not reach this country; and after four months, he should make over Kālpi and the other towns to Naṣīr Khān Jahān. When the foundations of the peace became strengthened by the physical and spiritual attention of Shaikh Jāīaldah, Sultān Maḥmūd Khālji granted permission to the emissary of Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī after bestowing rewards and favours on him to retire; and he himself cast the shadow of his favour on the residents of his capital of Mandū.

And Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī also returned to Jaunpūr; and on his arrival there, bringing out the hand of lavishness and benevolence from the sleeve of generosity and liberality made all sections of the people, according to the difference of their ranks, fortunate and happy.

<sup>1</sup> And when he had rested for some time at Jaunpūr, and his army had repaired the damages and losses which it had sustained he advanced towards the country of <sup>2</sup> Chunār, and having plundered and devastated that country, made all the refractory people of that neighbourhood, food for the sword. He took possession of some *parganas* and towns, and left *thānodārs* there, and having made the necessary arrangements returned to Jaunpūr.

After some days he advanced into the country of Orīssa with the object of *Jihād* (war of religion) and the intention of becoming a Ghāzī; and having plundered and devastated that country, and pulled down and destroyed idol temples, returned with triumph and victory; and in the year 862 A.H., (1458 A.D.), he was united with the divine mercy.

The period of his reign was <sup>3</sup> twenty-one years and some months.

---

AN ACCOUNT OF <sup>1</sup> SULTĀN MAḤMŪD SHĀH, SON OF MAḤMŪD SHĀH.

When Sultān Maḥmūd Sharqī passed away from amongst (men), the *amīrs* and the pillars of the state raised Shāhẓāda Bhikan Khān, who was his eldest son, on the throne of the empire; and gave him the title of Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh. As he was unfit for the duties of a ruler, he perpetrated deeds which were improper for him. The *amīrs* and the chief men of the country excused him from carrying on the government; and raised his brother Ḥusain Khān to the position of power.

The time of his (*i.e.*, Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh's) rule <sup>2</sup> was about five months.

## AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN ḤUSAIN, SON OF MAḤMŪD SHĀH.

As they excused Maḥmūd Shāh his brother from the duties of government, they raised him to the seat of power, and made a proclamation of justice and equity. All the *amīrs* and great men submitted to him and obeyed him. As the *humā* (a fabulous bird) of his noble spirit had the ambition of conquering various countries in its head, he collected three hundred thousand horsemen and fourteen hundred elephants, and <sup>3</sup> advanced towards the country of Orissa. In the course of the march he subjected the country of Tīrhūt to various calamities; and levied tribute from the refractory people <sup>4</sup> of that

<sup>1</sup> One MS. leaves out the word Sultān before Maḥmūd Shāh. He is called Maḥmūd Shāh in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. His correct title was Sultān Mulaḥammad Shāh according to Firishlah and according to the Cambridge History of India. The account of his five months' rule, as given here, is very vague and lazy. For a fuller and more vivid account see under Bahlūl Lūdī, pages 343-45 of vol. I of the translation.

<sup>2</sup> The word is است, *i.e.*, is, in the MS. and in the lith. ed. I have changed it to بود, was.

<sup>3</sup> The account of the invasion of Orissa, and of the devastation of Tīrhūt on the way, as given by Firishlah and the Cambridge History of India (p. 255), agrees mainly with that in the text. The numbers of horsemen and elephants in Sultān Ḥusain's army appear to be exaggerated.

<sup>4</sup> There are differences in the readings. One MS. has متوجه متمردان گرفت, which is incorrect and meaningless. The other has از متمردان ان ناحین خراج گرفته. This is better, but ناحین should be changed to ناحیت and گرفته to گرفت. The lith. ed. has از متمردان اندیار ناحیت خراج



to Dehli. Sultān Bahlūl, making humility and a piteous appeal the means of his safety, sent a message to Sultān Ḥusain, that the country of Dehli would belong to the servants of the Sultān, if he would leave the country round Dehli for a distance of eighteen *karōhs* in his possession; and he should be enlisted in the bands of the Sultān's servants, and would remain in the post of the *dārōgha* of Dehli, on behalf of the latter. Sultān Ḥusain, on account of his great pride and haughtiness, did not listen to these proposals, with the intention of consent and acceptance. In the end, Sultān Bahlūl, relying on divine aid and assistance, came out of Dehli with eighteen thousand horsemen, and encamped in front of Sultān Ḥusain's army. As the river <sup>1</sup> Jamunā lay between the two armies, neither advanced to give battle. It so happened, however, that one day, Sultān <sup>2</sup> Ḥusain's soldiers had gone on a marauding excursion, and except for the commanders no one was left in the camp. Sultān Bahlūl's soldiers taking advantage of such an opportunity plunged their horses into the river <sup>3</sup> at the time of midday. Although this news was taken to Sultān Ḥusain, he did not, owing to his haughtiness and pride, believe it, until Sultān Bahlūl's men stretched their hands to plunder the camp and seized its outskirts. In this way Sultān Ḥusain was defeated without a battle; and *Malkah-i-Jahān* and all the inmates of the harem were seized. Sultān Bahlūl having regard for the rights of the salt he had eaten, endeavoured to show all respect and honour to *Malkah-i-Jahān*, and having made necessary preparations, sent her to Sultān Ḥusain.

When *Malkah-i-Jahān* joined the Sultān, she again <sup>4</sup> got into his kernel and skin; and again commenced to incite him; and in the

<sup>1</sup> آب جون in the text-edition.

<sup>2</sup> Firishtah's statement is just the opposite. He says سرداران بزرگ حسین. *شاه شرقی بباخت ولایت رفتند*. The Cambridge History of India (p. 256) says Husain Shāh was "accustomed to permit nearly the whole of his army to disperse for the purpose of plundering the rich villages of the Doāb".

<sup>3</sup> The words are وقت استوا. I cannot find any meaning of 'استوا', which quite suits the context. Firishtah says در عین موسم تابستان از جایکه پایاب بود i.e., in the very midst of the hot season at a place where there it could be forded.

<sup>4</sup> Firishtah uses the same words. I do not know their exact meaning, but I suppose it is either acquired great influence over him, or worried him by constant iteration.



following year induced him again to collect and equip his army to fight with Sultān Bahlūl. When there was only a short distance between the two armies, Sultān Bahlūl sent an emissary with the following message, "Would the Sultān be pleased to pardon my offences; and leave me in my present condition; for I shall one day be of use to him".

As <sup>1</sup> the pen of fate had so decreed, that greatness should pass away from the dynasty of the Sharqī Sultāns, Sultān Ḥusain did not at all listen to his words. After the forces had been arrayed, defeat again fell on the Jaunpūr army. In the same way, on a second occasion, he came with a well-equipped army, but had to take to flight. On the <sup>2</sup> fourth occasion things became so difficult for Sultān Ḥusain, that he had to throw himself off his horse and run away. <sup>3</sup> These facts have been narrated with full particulars and details, in the section about the Sultāns of Dehli.

On the <sup>4</sup> fourth occasion, Sultān Bahlūl took Jaunpūr into his own possession, and established his son Bārbak Shāh there. Sultān Ḥusain had to content himself with a section of his territory, the revenues of which amounted only to five *krors*, and to pass his time there. Sultān Bahlūl, acting in a spirit of generosity, did not interfere with him.

When Sultān Bahlūl accepted the summons of the just God; and the office of the Sultān was allotted to his son Sultān Sikandar, Sultān Ḥusain induced Bārbak Shāh to advance on Dehli and seize his father's kingdom for himself. With this intention Bārbak Shāh advanced from Jaunpūr towards Dehli. Then a battle took place, and Bārbak Shāh fled back to Jaunpūr. He again equipped an army, and advanced

<sup>1</sup> There are differences in the readings. One MS. has چون قلم تقدیر برین رفتہ بود. This appears to be correct and I have adopted it. The other MS. has برین رفتہ بود، چو تعدیر کہ دولت. The lith. ed. has چون تقریر بری رفتہ بود، the word تقریر being used by mistake for تقدیر.

<sup>2</sup> The third occasion is not mentioned, or the fourth occasion in the text here is a mistake for the third.

<sup>3</sup> See page 348 and the following pages of vol. I of the translation.

<sup>4</sup> It is چہارم in both MSS., and in the lith. ed. and in Firishtah; but a fourth occasion has already been mentioned in the previous paragraph.

to Dehli. When he fled a second time, Sultān Sikandar pursued him and took Jaunpūr out of his possession. As Sultān Ḥusain was the cause of all the confusion and disturbance, Sultān Sikandar went and attacked him; and after some fighting seized the territory which was in his possession. Sultān Ḥusain then fled, and found an asylum with the ruler of Bangālah. The term of his reign was 19 years. After his defeat, he was for some years <sup>2</sup> confined in the bounds of borrowed life, (which is a very figurative way of saying that he lived for some years). After that the Sharqī Empire came to an end. Six persons ruled for a period of 97 years and some months.

---

<sup>1</sup> One MS. has by mistake مرعوم for مرعون; and the other has مشعاد for مستعار.